George Bereday (Ed.)

The Politics of SOVIET EDUCATION

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Bereday, George Z F ed.
The politics of Soviet education.

Reprint of the ed. published by Praeger, New York, which was issued as no. 86 of Praeger publications in Russian history and world communism.
Includes bibliographical references.
1. Education—Russia—History. I. Pennar, Jaan. II. Title.
[LA831.82.B42 1976] 370'.947 75-28662
ISBN 0-8371-8477-0

© *1960 by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc.*

Originally published in 1960 by Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, New York

Reprinted with the permission of Praeger Publishers, Inc.

Reprinted in 1976 by Greenwood Press,
a division of Williamhouse-Regency Inc.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 75-28662

ISBN 0-8371-8477-0

Printed in the United States of America

Editors' Introduction

Now that the market for writings on Soviet education has become inexhaustible and we are flooded by sometimes shrewd and sometimes naïve eyewitness accounts of Soviet schools and universities, there is a need, greater than ever, for serious, painstaking research in the field. The collection of essays presented in this volume has been drawn up with this purpose in mind. Each represents a study of some six months by a young scholar familiar with the Russian language, who, in July 1958, attended a three-week seminar at the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. in Munich, Germany, where he discussed his findings with colleagues and studied Soviet sources.

Researchers from the United States, Holland, France, Germany, Iran, and Italy were represented at the seminar. They came with training in the disciplines of political science, history, sociology, language and literature, economics, and education. Six members of the seminar from American universities had recently traveled in the Soviet Union. One member was a native of prewar Estonia, one a native of Poland, and one was of Ukrainian background. Two of the participants had lived in the U.S.S.R. a number of years; two others, who had grown up there were, as staff members of the Institute, studying Soviet schools of which they were themselves graduates. Thus, the seminar provided an opportunity for a *joint exchange of opinions on Soviet education*, an opportunity which was unique since it brought together specialists in the field who held differing views

because of their varied backgrounds. We have called the resulting proceedings *The Politics of Soviet Education* after the classic of Aristotle, since our discussion produced an emphasis on the social circumstances amidst which education takes place and which permeate it.

But we also had a second purpose. In educational research, no less than in other areas of research on Soviet life, the necessity for a continuous *follow-up of Soviet printed sources* cannot be too urgently emphasized. Such research is equal in importance to actual eyewitness reports. The preparation and support of specialists competent to pursue it requires foresight, advance planning, and incentive. Since the volume of such research at present is small, the seminar in Munich was organized with this contribution in mind. We are indebted to the American Council on Germany and to the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. for making this contribution financially possible and for providing quarters and other facilities.

Since each of the seminar participants wrote on a topic of his choice, the assembled essays do not represent a complete coverage of Soviet education. We lack in particular (beyond its general treatment in the introductory essay) a specific appraisal of science education and of its relation to recent Soviet technological successes. Fortunately, several good sources in this area have been published recently, and more are likely to be published in the future. This volume represents research in other important areas. The full appraisal of the potentialities of Soviet schools requires an extensive knowledge of all the varied facets of their operation. We hope that this collection of essays will add to the growing understanding of Soviet education—an understanding which is of vital importance to us today.

George Z. F. Bereday
Jaan Pennar

New York, N. Y.
December, 1959

Contents

	EDITORS' INTRODUCTION	vi
1.	A GENERAL VIEW OF SOVIET EDUCATION **Ramazan Karça**	3
2.	POLYTECHNICAL EDUCATION AND THE NEW SOVIET SCHOOL REFORMS **Richard V. Rapacz**	28
3.	PARTY CONTROL OVER SOVIET SCHOOLS **Jaan Pennar**	45
4.	CLASS TENSIONS IN SOVIET EDUCATION **George Z. F. Bereday**	57
5.	ANTIRELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF SOVIET YOUTH **Alessio U. Floridi**	89
6.	THE TEACHING OF HISTORY IN SOVIET SCHOOLS: A STUDY IN METHODS **William K. Medlin**	100
7.	NOTES ON FOREIGN-LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE U.S.S.R. **David Burg**	117
8.	EXTRACURRICULAR AND EXTRASCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES FOR SOVIET SCHOOL CHILDREN **Irene Mareuil**	132

9. Recent Changes in the Training of Soviet Secondary-School Teachers 144
Norton Dodge

10. Moscow University: The Summit of Soviet Higher Education 164
Burton Rubin

11. Some Sociological Perspectives on Soviet Education: Selection and Training for Advanced Studies 175
Mark G. Field

Notes 192

Notes on Contributors 218

THE POLITICS OF SOVIET EDUCATION

1. A General View of Soviet Education[1]

by RAMAZAN KARÇA

The current successes of the U.S.S.R. in the field of rocket technology and the launching of artificial earth satellites have aroused great interest throughout the free world in the Soviet educational system. And, indeed, although it is still difficult to establish a direct connection between specific military-technological achievements and the general level of Soviet technology, and, consequently, technical education in the U.S.S.R., it is nevertheless beyond dispute that the Soviet system of education can boast significant successes. Thus, its study is of considerable importance at the present moment.

The Soviet leaders attribute their achievements in the field of education to the "superiority" of the socialist system over capitalism. In all justice, we must admit that this assertion contains a grain of truth. Soviet experience shows that, with all other factors equal, a totalitarian regime, having at its unlimited command both the material resources and the human energies of a vast country enormously rich in natural resources, can achieve much more than any democratic state. While in democracies the problems of the school and, particularly, of higher education are approached from the point of view of narrowly national or provincial interest and are dealt with by individual social groups, their organizations, or even by private persons, in the Soviet Union these problems are considered to be matters of state and political importance. As early as 1918, the program of the Communist Party, drafted by Lenin and adopted in 1919,

stated that one of the Party's tasks during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat was to complete the work of transforming the schools into "an instrument for the Communist regeneration of society" and to bring up a generation capable of establishing Communism.[2] The training of specialists in the fields of industry and technology was seen and is seen today as the basic condition for the most rapid possible development of the economic and military power of the Soviet Union, which is expected to serve as the arsenal of the world Communist revolution.

Since 1928, when the Party adopted the policy of rapid industrialization of the country, the Soviet government has pursued an intensive program of developing a network of schools providing higher technical education and training engineers. In 1928, there were only twenty-six higher technical schools in the country; by 1950, their number had risen to 165.[3] During the past seven years, thirty-five more higher technical schools have been established in the U.S.S.R., chiefly in the new industrial regions—Siberia, Central Asia, and the Far East. Thus, the Soviet Union today has 200 higher technical educational institutions, with a student body of 786,000.[4]

General Schools

The organization of the entire system of public education is also subordinated to the goals of speeded-up and mass-scale training of specialists in all branches of technology and science. These factors are reflected in the following:

1. Monopolization of education by the Communist state, which makes it impossible for the public or the teachers to interfere in school affairs.

2. Standardization of study plans, curricula, and textbooks both in general and in special schools, with broad emphasis on natural and mathematical sciences, which are required for all students.

3. Free education in the secondary general schools and

government stipends for out-of-town students in secondary special schools and for students of higher educational institutions.

4. The granting of various privileges to higher technical schools to attract the most gifted of Soviet youth, especially from among Communist elements and those close to the regime.

Most Soviet students are eager to learn and work assiduously in the higher educational institutions to acquire special education. An important incentive is the fact that under the Soviet regime, where private property has been abolished and no opportunities exist for expressing personal initiative in industry, agriculture, commerce, or other areas of life, the sole condition for a tolerable existence is a diploma from a higher educational institution. To obtain this document, which, together with a Party card, also makes it possible to enter the ruling Communist circles or the ranks of the well-paid intelligentsia, young people in the Soviet Union study with a degree of concentration that is quite unknown in other countries. In their effort to obtain a diploma, young men and women often enter institutes and schools in fields that are quite remote from their interests and inclinations. The fear of remaining in the ranks of petty employees, workers, or peasants, without real rights and subject to exploitation by the state, compels even the most intelligent and discriminating young secondary-school students to study without protest, along with scientific and useful subjects, such pseudoscientific and dubious subjects as: the constitution of the U.S.S.R., and Soviet history and literature; and in the higher schools: the history of the C.P.S.U., Marxism-Leninism, and political economy. These create an atmosphere of scholasticism and dogmatism in the schools that is reminiscent of the Middle Ages.

Special education depends on the organization of general education. Until 1959, the basic type of secondary general school in the U.S.S.R. was the ten-year school, consisting of three levels: the primary school, with its four-year course of study (for children of seven to eleven years); the seven-year school (for ages seven to fourteen); and the secondary school, with a ten-year

course of study (for ages seven to seventeen). Current legislation has added an eighth year to the seven-year school, thus creating eleven-year secondary schools. But the actual conversion has only just begun, thus justifying, for the time being, the references to seven-year schools. The corresponding classes of all these types of schools follow the same curricula, enabling students to proceed easily from one school to another, and later to a higher school.[5]

The network of these three levels of general schools is not the same everywhere. In thinly populated regions, especially in the Turkestani republics, most of the villages have only primary schools; the seven-year and secondary schools are found in the district centers and cities. Since there are no boarding schools for out-of-town pupils, children who have graduated from village primary schools situated far from district centers cannot continue their education in the seven-year and secondary schools, despite the 1939 law which provides for universal seven-year schooling throughout the country.[6] At present, the network of seven-year and secondary schools covers only the European part of the country and the Caucasian republics.

Soviet pedagogues assert that the Soviet secondary school is the most advanced in the world, giving its students a knowledge of the fundamentals of natural and social sciences and human thought. But this is not altogether true. Social sciences are taught in the Soviet schools in conformity with the interests of official ideology and the ruling Party elite. Moreover, the views of Soviet leaders regarding historical events and personalities undergo frequent change. One serious Soviet journal was compelled to admit in 1956 that, during the period of the so-called "cult of personality" in the U.S.S.R., "lack of principle and timeserving resulted in a situation where students had to hear, in the course of their school years, mutually exclusive appraisals of the historical roles of Peter the First, Ivan the Terrible, Alexander Nevsky, Suvorov, Kutuzov, Shamil, and many others."[7] The study of the laws governing thought has fared even worse in Soviet schools: logic is not taught at all. True, in 1947, Stalin gave permission for

its inclusion in the curriculum. But in 1955, when the "shift to Lenin" began, Stalin's heirs hastened to expel logic from the secondary school. And the only psychology that is taught in the schools treats man's entire mental life from the viewpoint of the Party.

In the teaching of natural sciences, however, the Soviet school may indeed claim superiority. Mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, geography, astronomy, and drafting are taught in larger doses in Soviet schools than in pre-Soviet Russian institutions or most present Western schools. Although some of these disciplines are subjected to atheistic and materialistic interpretations, they are nevertheless taught at a level which permits secondary-school graduates to continue their education at higher educational institutions in any field, and particularly in the areas of natural science, mathematics, and technological studies. Thus, under the curriculum followed in Soviet schools from 1933 to 1955, the total of 9,669 school hours offered during the ten years of general schooling included 2,113 hours of mathematics (arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and trigonometry), 478 hours of physics, 330 hours of chemistry, 445 hours of natural science, 33 hours of astronomy, and 132 hours of drafting. It is important to add that mathematics was taught for ten years, physics for five, chemistry for four, and drafting for four.[8] True, in the 1955-56 school year, the so-called polytechnization of the secondary school, i.e., the introduction into the curriculum of sessions of work and practice in the fields of agriculture, machinery, and electrotechnics had a somewhat adverse effect on the theoretical study of the natural sciences and mathematics. This is reflected in the diminished knowledge of the graduates of recent years as they enter higher educational institutions. Nevertheless, even in the present curriculum, a solid place is occupied by the natural and mathematical sciences, which are assigned 3,671 hours, or 37.24 per cent of the total number of hours in the secondary school (9,857).[9] There is no reason to believe that the 1958 reforms will fundamentally alter the situation. It is common knowledge that Soviet schoolwork

follows a rigidly prescribed schedule, that high demands are made upon both the teachers and the students, and that strict discipline prevails in the school. These are venerable traditions that are bound to continue.

In addition to the basic type of general schools described above, other types of general educational institutions have gradually developed in the U.S.S.R. The appearance of these schools was dictated by life itself, as a result of the class differentiation of Soviet society. These schools fall into several categories:

1. **The special schools:** These were established in big cities in 1935 for boys who completed the seven-year school with excellent marks in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other exact sciences. These schools, with a three-year course of study, prepare their students for entrance into military engineering, naval, artillery, and aviation schools and institutes and are within the jurisdiction of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Defense.[10]

2. **The Suvorov and Nakhimov schools:** These schools are closed military and naval schools, where the students are fully maintained by the state. They were established in 1943-44 by decree of the U.S.S.R. Council of People's Commissars and the Central Committee of the Party for sons of officers killed in the war.[11] Today, these schools admit the sons of the Soviet military aristocracy. Most of their students also go on to military and naval higher schools.

3. **Schools for working-class and rural youth:** The schools for working-class youth were set up in 1943; those for rural youth in 1944. These are evening schools, consisting of fifth to tenth, or fifth to seventh grades. They provide schooling for young people who work in industry or agriculture.[12]

4. **Boarding schools:** These schools are closed institutions for children of the Soviet poor (husbandless mothers and disabled veterans of industry and war), as well as for children whose families are unable to provide the necessary conditions for their upbringing.[13] These schools were also opened in 1956 to that portion of student youth which resists Communist upbringing and education in regular schools.[14] For the maintenance of their children in the boarding schools, parents must pay the

state a certain sum, depending on the family income, but poor parents are exempt from these payments. Officially, it is maintained that the program of the boarding schools is the same as that of the regular schools, but in reality it is aimed at special character education of the pupils and training in physical labor.

Specialized Schools

Specialized or professional education in the U.S.S.R. falls into three categories: lower, intermediate, and advanced.

1. **Lower specialized education:** This includes the training of skilled workers for various branches of the economy. Until 1940, the basic system for training workers consisted of Factory Apprenticeship Schools (*Shkoly fabrichnozavodskogo uchenichestva* [*FZU*]), with training periods that lasted from six months to two years, depending on the specialization and the entrant's general educational level. The students were usually teen-age workers (fifteen to eighteen years) who had graduated from the primary or seven-year school and had no opportunity to continue their schooling. However, in 1940—in view of the Soviet Union's imminent entry into the war—the former voluntary influx of youth into industry via these schools became insufficient, and a shortage of workers developed in heavy industry, in the mines, and in transportation. Consequently, in 1940, the Soviet government issued a decree "Concerning the State Labor Reserves of the U.S.S.R.," instituting an annual mobilization of 800,000 to 1,000,000 young workers and peasants for the training of labor reserves. This decree established:

a. **Trade schools,** with a two-year course of study for the training of metal workers, metallurgists, miners, oil workers, and workers for other heavy industries.

b. **Railroad schools,** with a two-year course of study, for the training of railway transportation workers.

c. **Factory apprenticeship schools,** for the training of workers for mass production on the assembly lines.

The trade and railroad schools admit young people of both sexes, ages fourteen to fifteen, who must be primary-school

graduates. The factory schools admit boys and girls of sixteen to eighteen who have graduated from the seven-year school. The young people studying at these schools are maintained by the government.

After the war of 1941-45, special trade and agricultural schools were established, with three- and four-year courses of study for orphans and children living in children's homes. Also established were mining industry schools, with a seven-year course of study (following primary school).[15]

Finally, in recent years (since 1954), a new type of technical school has been established, with a course of study lasting from one to two years, for young people between the ages of seventeen to twenty-five who have completed their secondary education. These schools train skilled workers and junior technical personnel for technical occupations. In 1955, schools were set up for the training of tractor drivers, combine mechanics and operators, and other workers in agriculture.

The study plans and curricula of all these schools vary according to the field of specialization, but the over-all scheme of instruction is basically the same: general subjects are given only 15 to 20 per cent of the school hours, while 80 to 85 per cent of the time is devoted to occupational training.[16] After completing the course of study, graduates of these schools must work in industry for four years.

In 1955, the system of state labor reserves included more than 3,000 schools (exclusive of technical schools). They are at present training workers in more than 500 specializations. During the period of 1940-56, the trade schools and the factory-workshop schools alone have turned out more than 8,000,000 skilled workers.[17]

The schools of the state labor reserve system provide training and assignment of their graduates and are under the jurisdiction of the Main Administration of Labor Reserves of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers and its departments in the Union and autonomous republics, territories, and regions. The enlistment of students is carried out by the councils of ministers of the

Union republics, by territorial and regional executive committees, and by the Main Administration of Labor Reserves, in accordance with the numbers and dates specified by the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers.[18]

Thus, instead of creating material incentives for the voluntary influx of labor power into industry, the Soviet government employs a system of compulsory mobilization and training of workers. The total number of workers enlisted in the past seventeen years is theoretically more than 15,000,000.

2. **Intermediate Specialized Education:** The training of intermediate specialists for all branches of the nation's economic and cultural life takes place in the intermediate special schools. The principal types of these institutions are: the so-called technicums (industrial, transport, building, agricultural, etc.), with a four-year course of study; teachers' schools, music and art schools, etc., with a four-year course of study; and medical, law, economics, and other schools, with three- to four-year courses.[19] In addition to these regular schools, there are also evening and home-study or correspondence schools. Until 1959, these were under the jurisdiction of the appropriate ministries of the respective Union and autonomous republics and were financed by them.[20] However, the general educational and methodological direction (including the establishment of curricula and programs) is in the hands of the U.S.S.R. or republic Ministry of Higher Education.

The intermediate special schools admit U.S.S.R. citizens of both sexes, ages fourteen to thirty, who have graduated from seven-year or secondary school. They also admit trade-school graduates who have passed the competitive entrance examinations after working the required four years in their trades. Graduates of the seven-year school who have won certificates of merit and secondary-school graduates who were awarded gold or silver medals "for excellent achievement and exemplary conduct" are admitted without entrance examinations, regardless of the year of graduation.[21]

The curricula of the intermediate special educational institu-

tions include: (1) general subjects (the native language, literature, history, the history of the C.P.S.U., mathematics, natural sciences, physics, chemistry, etc.); (2) subjects in the field of specialization of the given school; and (3) practical training in production. The theoretical studies take the form of lectures and classroom work; the practical studies are conducted in special laboratories, workshops, training farms, etc.; and practical experience is gained in industrial enterprises, sovkhozes and kolkhozes, hospitals, schools, and so forth, depending on the specialization. The graduating students take state examinations or defend their diploma project (in technical specializations) before state boards of experts. Those who win their diplomas are assigned to jobs by the central organs in accordance with previously prepared plans. They are sent wherever there is a demand for them, regardless of their preferences. After three years of practical work in their fields, the young specialists have the right to continue their education in the higher schools (especially in the evening or correspondence schools) on a regular basis. Particularly outstanding graduates (usually some 5 per cent) are permitted to go on to the higher schools without practical experience.

In the 1955-56 school year, there were in the U.S.S.R. 3,753 specialized intermediate educational institutions, with a student body of 1,960,400, including forty-one correspondence schools with 286,500 students. Divided according to various fields, the student enrollment falls into the following groups: industry and construction—843,100; transport and communication—150,300; agriculture—337,800; economics and law—134,600; education—247,200; public health, physical culture, and sports —215,900; art and the cinema—31,500.[22]

The network of special intermediate educational institutions during the 1955-56 school year was distributed as follows among the Union republics: R.S.F.S.R.—2,220 schools, with 1,200,960 students (in 1956-57—2,164 schools, with 1,243,600 students); Ukrainian S.S.R.—635 schools, with 374,642 students; Belorussian S.S.R.—123 schools, with 60,148 students; Uzbek S.S.R.—

100 schools, with 58,112 students; Kazakh S.S.R.—134 schools, with 67,431 students; Georgian S.S.R.—105 schools, with 30,148 students; Azerbaidzhani S.S.R.—79 schools, with 29,255 students; Lithuanian S.S.R.—66 schools, with 22,321 students; Moldavian S.S.R.—37 schools, with 18,507 students; Latvian S.S.R.—65 schools, with 25,108 students; Kirghiz S.S.R.—28 schools, with 13,587 students; Takzhik S.S.R.—33 schools, with 13,423 students; Armenian S.S.R.—45 schools, with 17,015 students; Turkmenian S.S.R.—37 schools, with 13,589 students; Estonian S.S.R.—46 schools, with 16,140 students.[23]

3. **Advanced Specialized Education:** The training of specialists at the highest level for all branches of the economy, cultural life, science, technology, the government apparatus, and military posts is carried out in the U.S.S.R. in the higher specialized educational institutions. The higher educational institutions in the U.S.S.R. are of two basic types—universities and institutes; some of these institutions are also called academies.

The universities train scientific workers in the basic theoretical disciplines for work in research institutions, as well as teachers for the secondary schools. The term of study in the universities is five years. Formerly, Russian universities usually had four faculties: physical–mathematical, historical–philological, law, and medicine. Soviet universities, on the other hand, try to bring education closer to the practical problems facing the country and have many faculties. Thus, in 1950, Moscow University had eleven faculties: physics, mechanics and mathematics, chemistry, geography, biology and soil, geology, history, philology, philosophy, law, and economics, as well as the following research institutes: mathematics, mechanics, physics, chemistry, and astronomy, with dozens of laboratories, study rooms, and scientific stations. Leningrad University had thirteen faculties in 1957 (the same as Moscow University, with the addition of faculties of oriental studies and foreign languages), eight research institutes, many laboratories, and a number of auxiliary scientific-educational establishments.[24] Other universities have six to eight faculties, depending on local conditions and the need

for cadres in given fields of specialization. In addition to Leningrad University, several others (Armenian, Azerbaidzhani, and Uzbek) have faculties of oriental studies; some of them also have faculties of foreign languages, technical, aviation, and other departments.

The basic type of higher educational institution in the U.S.S.R. is the institute. There are technical, agricultural, medical, pedagogic, economics, arts, military, and other institutes. Their courses of study are usually from four to six years, and they consist of several departments or faculties—usually from three to eight.

The technical institutes are of two types—polytechnical institutes and institutes devoted to the various branches of industry. The polytechnical institutes are usually divided into many faculties and train engineers for various branches of the national economy. Thus, the Kalinin Polytechnical Institute in Leningrad has eight departments: metallurgy, mechanics and machine-building, electromechanics, powermachine-building, engineering-economics, physio-mechanics, engineering-construction, and hydro-melioration.

The technical institutes within the various branches of the economy train engineers in their respective fields, such as: machine-building, mining, metallurgy, chemistry, energetics, light industry, food industry, building, transport, forest industries, etc. During the past fifteen years, new machine-building institutes have been established in various centers throughout the country. The new Moscow institutes train their students in automechanics, machine-tool construction, aviation, mechanics, and chemical machine-building. The Leningrad institutes are devoted to shipbuilding, aviation, precision mechanics, and optics.[25] The Moscow Engineering and Physics Institute (founded in 1942) has four departments: engineering-physics, instrument construction, physio-mechanics, and mechanics-technology. The first three train engineers in design, research, and exploitation of modern physical installations and machines, electronic-ionic and other

physical apparatus, tele-measurement devices, tele-direction, and automation processes.[26] The decree of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers of August 30, 1954, ordered the elimination of such excessive division of technical specialties and provided for the training of specialists with broader qualifications.[27]

Agricultural institutes may be of two types: complex ones and those devoted to special branches of agriculture. The latter include institutes of husbandry (with departments devoted to selection and seed-raising, fruit and vegetable growing, cotton growing, agrochemistry, silk-worm breeding, plant protection, etc.); veterinarian medicine, zootechnics, zoo-veterinary institutes (for large horned cattle, horse-breeding, sheep-raising, etc.); institutes of mechanization and electrification of agriculture; and institutes of land management (with land-management, geodetic, meliorative, and other departments).[28]

The institutes of economics are divided into economics and statistical (with departments devoted to trade economics, science of commodities, economic accounting, economics and planning of government supply, and technology); financial and financial-economic (with the following departments: finance, credit economics, economic accounting, international finance relations, mechanization of accounting, and computing work); engineering-economic (training engineers-economists in the fields of energetics, metallurgy, mechanical engineering, chemistry, construction, air and auto transport, city management, material-technical supply of enterprises in the mechanical-engineering and building industries);[29] transport economics; trade economics; foreign trade; demography; etc.

Other institutes, such as the pedagogic, medical, and law institutes, as well as the higher educational institutions in the art fields (conservatories, theatrical schools, cinematography institutes, and institutes of the screen, painting, and architecture) are in the main devoted to a single field and have two or three departments. The higher military schools (academies and institutes) are divided into general and special ones; the latter

are classified according to the type of armed forces they serve: military–engineering, military–naval, air force, artillery, tank corps, and others, as well as medical and political.[30]

During the early years of the Soviet regime, jurisdiction over the higher educational institutions was in the hands of the people's commissariats of education of the Union republics. In 1930, the higher technical, agricultural, medical, and certain other schools were transferred to the jurisdiction of the corresponding all-Union commissariats. In order to establish a single directing agency, the Committee for the Affairs of Higher Education was set up in 1936, under the U.S.S.R. Council of People's Commissars. Finally, in 1946, the Committee was replaced by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education which directs all higher educational institutions. The most important educational institutions (universities; technical, agricultural, economics, and law institutes, as well as certain other schools) are entirely under its jurisdiction in their organizational, educational-methodological, financial, and economic affairs. Others (such as medical schools, teachers' institutes, art schools, etc.) are under the direction of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education in their educational work and methodology, while remaining within the system of their corresponding ministries regarding organization and finance. The U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education and the newly created republic ministries subordinate to it appoint the heads of all higher educational institutions, develop and approve the curricula and programs, confirm the membership of the learned councils of the educational institutions and the composition of the state examining commissions, fix the number of students, and so on.[31]

At the same time, direction and control over the higher educational institutions is also maintained along Party lines—through the departments of schools and science of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Party's central committees in the various Union republics. All the major organizational and academic problems are first discussed in the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and subsequently turned over to the

Ministry of Higher Education. This principle of leadership extends to all the other areas of public education in the U.S.S.R.

A university is headed by a rector, and an institute by a director. The educational and scientific work of the school is under the control of its deputies (vice-rector in universities, and deputy director in institutes). In every higher educational institution there is an academic council, with the rector (or director) serving as its chairman. The council is composed of the vice-rector (or deputy director) for educational affairs, his assistant for administrative and economic affairs, the faculty deans, heads of departments (chairs), some of the professors, the chief librarian, and representatives of the Party, the Komsomol, and the professional organization of the given institution.

The teaching personnel consists of professors, assistant professors (*dotsent*), assistants, senior instructors, and instructors; the auxiliary personnel consists of senior laboratory technicians, senior laboratory assistants, and assistants. The posts of professor and assistant professor are filled on a competitive basis by persons with the appropriate rank. The title of professor is awarded by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Higher Education to scientific workers possessing the degree of doctor of sciences in the given field of specialization. The title of *dotsent* is bestowed by the Commission on scientific workers possessing the degree of candidate of science (*kandidat nauk*).[32]

The higher educational institutions admit persons of both sexes up to the age of thirty-five who have completed their secondary education and passed the entrance examinations to these institutions. Graduates of intermediate special schools and technical schools are admitted to the higher educational institutions (*VUZ*) if they pass the examinations and have the legally required three years of work experience after graduation from their schools. This work experience is not required from persons who did active military service on graduation, or from those in the top 5 per cent of the graduates. Persons awarded gold medals on graduation from secondary school "for excellent

achievements and exemplary conduct" were, under the rules of 1957, admitted to higher educational institutions without entrance examinations; recipients of silver medals of this type were also admitted to certain groups of higher educational institutions on the same conditions. In 1958, these privileges were abolished, along with the right of the top 5 per cent of the graduates of special intermediate schools to exemption from entrance examinations when entering the higher educational institutions in their fields. Only veterans of World War II who won medals on graduation from secondary school or who have certificates of graduation with special honors are now admitted to the *VUZ's* without entrance examinations.[33]

First priority in noncompetitive admission to the higher educational institutions is given to applicants who pass the entrance examinations and have worked for at least two years in some branch of the national economy or some cultural field, as well as to former participants in World War II and demobilized veterans of the Soviet army and navy. According to the new rules of 1958, up to 80 per cent of the planned number of admissions to a given *VUZ* or faculty is to be allotted to applicants with the right to noncompetitive and priority admission. Only "not less than 20 per cent of admissions" is left for the young people who possess no other qualification except graduation from the general or specialized secondary schools. The recent regulations have placed this basic mass of secondary-school graduates, which has the greatest interest in higher education and which is best endowed to pursue it, in an ever more disadvantageous position in regard to entering the higher schools. Current experimentation and reforms seem to indicate a continuation of such policies.

In addition to the factor of the fanatical pursuit of industrialization and mechanization, an enormous role is played in this situation by political fears and considerations. Because of the moral and political ferment among students in recent years, still greater attention is paid today than in the past to the selection of candidates for higher education from among ele-

ments with the strongest ties to the regime. Even formerly, applicants to the higher educational institutions were compelled to submit to the admission boards, along with other documents, character and conduct references from local Party, Komsomol, and other organizations.[34] But there is a new element in this system of open political control: the admission boards headed by the director or the rector of the given *VUZ*, which decide on the applications of prospective students, now include representatives of the Party, trade-union, and Komsomol organizations of the city (or, in big cities, of the district), as well as the leading workers of the Party, trade-union, and Komsomol organizations of the school.[35]

The rules for admission to correspondence and evening schools, departments, and faculties (which do not involve interruption of work) are essentially analogous to those of the regular daytime higher educational institutions, but set no age restrictions and follow somewhat different priority requirements, such as length of experience and qualifications for the particular field of specialization chosen by the applicant.

The entrance examinations follow the programs approved by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education and are based on the curriculum of the secondary general school (the ten-year school). Applicants must pass examinations in the Russian language and literature and usually (an admission rule maintained by most of the higher educational institutions) in one foreign language (English, French, or German). The rest of the examinations (from two to five) differ according to the field of the higher educational institution and faculty.[36]

The curricula of the higher educational institutions, as confirmed by the Ministry of Higher Education, include disciplines in the following groups: socio-political (history of the C.P.S.U., dialectic and historical materialism, political economy); general (general theoretical); and special. In the higher technical schools there is also a group of general engineering subjects. The correlation between the individual groups of subjects in the various educational institutions and faculties differs. Thus, in

the faculties of experimental sciences in the universities the following proportions obtained in 1947: the socio-political group—approximately 6 per cent; the general—27 per cent; and special—67 per cent. In the higher technical schools the correlation is as follows: socio-economic group—some 7 per cent; general—30 per cent; general engineering—35 per cent; and special—28 per cent.[37]

An important place in the curricula is given to practical work in the field of specialization, which is allotted the following time during the student's entire period of attendance: sixteen to thirty-eight weeks in the higher technical educational institutions; forty to fifty-two weeks in agricultural colleges; an average of twelve weeks in pedagogical institutions; sixteen weeks in medical schools; and six to sixteen weeks in the universities.

The Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. labeled the insufficient connection between theoretical instruction and practical training in the higher schools a major shortcoming. It noted that the school lags behind the present level of technology and included in the directives for the Sixth Five-Year Plan a provision for strengthening the material base of the higher and intermediate educational institutions, for providing them in a more efficient manner with modern laboratory equipment, and for changes in the instruction methods aimed at bringing the students into closer contact with industrial experience and the latest achievements of both native and foreign science and technology.[38] In connection with these resolutions, it was proposed that the industrial experience of technical-school students be organized so that, from their very first year, students would work directly in industry, gradually learning the entire production process from the functions of semi-skilled workers, through those of highly skilled workers and junior technical personnel, and finally to those of persons directing specific sectors of the work.[39]

The school work is conducted according to the schedules established by the educational institution for a year or a semester. Attendance at all types of classes and school sessions is obligatory.[40] In recent years, steps have been taken to make attendance

at some of the less important courses optional, in order to encourage the students to independent work. However, afraid of weakening the influence of the higher educational institution on the students, the Soviet government cannot undertake any serious steps toward restoring the principle of voluntary attendance at lectures.[41]

At examination time, the student takes three or four examinations and as many tests. The results are rated according to the four-category system: "excellent," "good," "fair," and "poor." Satisfactory passing of tests is merely noted by the word "test." Every student has a test-book (matriculation record) where the results obtained in the examinations and tests are entered and signed by the professors and assistant professors. Students go on from lower to higher classes by passing all the required examinations and tests at the end of each school year. After they pass all their tests and course examinations, the last-year students defend their diploma projects or take state examinations conducted by the state examinations commission consisting of professors of the given institution of higher learning (*VUZ*) and a chairman appointed by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education.

The student who has passed the state examinations or has successfully defended his diploma paper or project is adjudged by the state examination commission qualified to work in his field of specialization and is awarded a diploma. The student who received "excellent" ratings in not less than 75 per cent of his subjects and "good" in the rest, and who has defended his diploma project or passed the state examinations with an "excellent" rating, is awarded a diploma with honors. Graduates of the higher educational institutions are assigned to work in their field in industrial enterprises, agriculture, transport, construction, hospitals, schools, etc., in accordance with the plan for interdepartmental allocations. They must remain in these jobs for at least three years.[42]

During the 1955-56 academic year, there were 765 higher educational institutions in the U.S.S.R., with an enrollment of

1,867,000 students. Twenty-two of these institutions were correspondence schools, with 639,100 students. The educational institutions devoted to various branches of the national economy and cultural life had the following enrollment during the same school year: industry and construction—550,600; transport and communication—99,000; agriculture—195,900; economics and law—106,700; education—741,600; public health and physical culture and sports—158,800; art and cinematography—14,400.[43]

The number of higher educational institutions and students in the Union republics in 1955-56 was as follows: R.S.F.S.R.—444 institutions with 1,176,166 students; Ukrainian S.S.R.—134 with 325,851 students; Belorussian S.S.R.—23 with 50,543 students; Uzbek S.S.R.—36 with 65,458 students; Kazakh S.S.R.—25 with 49,215 students; Georgian S.S.R.—19 with 37,948 students; Azerbaidzhani S.S.R.—14 with 34,699 students; Lithuanian S.S.R.—12 with 22,736 students; Moldavian S.S.R.—7 with 17,162 students; Latvian S.S.R.—9 with 15,691 students; Kirghiz S.S.R.—9 with 13,638 students; Tadzhik S.S.R.—8 with 14,443 students; Armenian S.S.R.—12 with 19,427 students; Turkmenian S.S.R.—6 with 12,160 students; Estonian S.S.R.—7 with 11,867 students.[44]

The principal method of training scientific workers is the system of graduate and research study (*aspirantura*) in research institutions, large institutes, and universities. Under the rules prevailing before 1956, admissions to graduate study were granted to persons who had completed their higher education and passed the final examinations, or who had defended their diploma papers or projects with excellent ratings, and who, in the course of their studies, had demonstrated their capacity for and interest in research or pedagogic work. In all the higher educational institutions there are student science clubs, science and technical circles and societies. In the course of three years, the aspirant must pass his candidate's examinations, complete his practical training in research and pedagogic work under the guidance of the professor assigned to him, and write and publicly

defend a dissertation for the academic degree of candidate (*Kandidat*) of science.[45]

To speed up the training of scientists with the highest qualification—doctors of science—doctoral training (*doktorantura*) was organized in 1947 in connection with the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. Somewhat later, it was also instituted at Moscow University, the Bauman Higher Technical School in Moscow, and several other major higher educational institutions.

In 1956, after a number of shortcomings were uncovered in the *aspirantura* system (special favors in admission, excessive lenience in evaluation of dissertations and the awarding of scientific degrees, etc.), a new system of admissions and training was introduced. At present, aspirant training is open only to persons who possess not less than two years of practical experience in the chosen field of scientific specialization and who have demonstrated their bent for research work. The system of training cadres through doctoral training (*doktorantura*) has been abolished,[46] but doctoral degrees continue to be awarded for exceptional academic achievement.

The education of both aspirants and students in the U.S.S.R. is free. Every aspirant receives a stipend from the government. Those who fail to follow their individual program of studies are expelled from aspirant training. Those who do exceptionally well are given higher stipends. In addition, the aspirant is given funds every year for professional literature as well as for field trips inside the country. Twice a year he is given vacations on full stipend: two months in summer and fifteen days in winter.

There is also a system of aspirant training by correspondence, which permits specialists who have completed their higher education to improve their qualifications without leaving their work in industry or institutions and to prepare to defend their candidates' dissertations.

The most capable of the candidates of science usually manage to combine practical work in research institutions, schools, or industry with writing and defending their doctoral dissertations.

Persons who manage to combine successfully their industrial or pedagogic activities with scientific work earn the right—on recommendation of the scientific and technical councils of ministries or agencies, or the learned councils of higher educational institutions and research organizations—to a leave of absence of up to six months for the completion of their doctoral dissertations.[47]

As of October 1, 1956, 125,000 persons were receiving aspirant training in higher educational institutions in the U.S.S.R., and more than 5,300 aspirants completed their training in 1956.[48] According to the U.S.S.R. Minister of Higher Education, V. P. Yelyutin, the country is still short of cadres in the advanced qualifications brackets—doctors of science and professors. The next task, therefore, in his opinion, is to step up the training of specialists, especially in physics, computing technology, electronics, semi-conductors, automation, tele-mechanics, and a number of other new scientific and technical fields.[49]

The Coming Changes

The Soviet educational system is relatively well-equipped organizationally for the tasks of training its students in the natural and mathematical sciences and for the mass production of specialists in the intermediate and higher qualification brackets in the fields of technics and technology. But pedagogically, the system is inferior to that of West European countries, especially with regard to the proper adjustment of the subject matter to grade levels, proper regard for the individual abilities and inclinations of students in the choice of education or profession, the general cultural level of teaching personnel, and the equipment of schools with modern scientific and technical facilities. Being aware of this, the Soviet leaders are constantly seeking to improve both the educational system as a whole and specialized education as such. To this end, the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences drew up a plan in 1957 for the development of public education in the U.S.S.R. for the next fifteen to twenty years, which, incidentally, calls for an increase in the number

of years at the secondary general school from ten to eleven or twelve.[50] Within the framework of this plan, a wide-scale experimental review has been conducted of the curricula, especially those of the secondary schools, which the Soviet leaders wish to adapt to the tasks of mass preparation of labor cadres for the rapidly developing militarized economy of the U.S.S.R.

Of great interest in this connection is N. S. Khrushchev's speech at the Thirteenth Congress of the All-Union Komsomol, the first of a series of speeches leading to the reform of December, 1958. This speech gave the first clear indication of the direction in which the Soviet system was to develop in the future. In the face of incontrovertible facts, Khrushchev was compelled to make two significant admissions: one, that higher education in the U.S.S.R. is available in fact and first of all to the children of Communists and elements close to them, while children of workers, peasants, and petty employees must, as "second-class citizens," go to work after graduation from the secondary schools. He called this a "shameful" situation, which corrupts "the democratic principles of Soviet socialism," and declared that the Bolsheviks will not fail to abolish this shortcoming. The second admission was that many young men and women enter given special educational institutions not because they possess the talents or desire to work in a special field, but because they were not admitted into the schools or faculties of their own choice and are determined to obtain a diploma from whatever *VUZ* they can gain admission to.[51]

How does the Soviet government plan to eliminate these "shameful conditions" and to improve the educational system generally? Briefly, the measures now legislated, and discussed more extensively in Mr. Rapacz's essay, are as follows: (1) reorganization of the secondary school in such a way that all pupils should receive trade instruction along with general education, acquire some working skill, and spend a certain amount of time at work in industry or agriculture; that students be sent to higher schools not because they have influential parents, but because they love the work and are capable of becoming specialists in

the higher qualification brackets; that selection of candidates for the higher schools should take place with the participation of the local Komsomol and trade-union organizations. (2) Organization of Factory-*VTUZ's* (a combination of industrial plants and higher technical educational institutions), where young people may acquire higher education while simultaneously working in these institutions as workers, foremen, etc. (3) Transfer of the higher and intermediate agricultural schools from the big cities to rural districts, and establishment of new ones near the big sovkhozes only, with admissions to be limited solely to applicants who actually plan to devote themselves to some agricultural profession. (4) Expansion on a much wider scale of the system of intermediate and higher schools operating as evening or correspondence schools.[52]

With the exception of the idea of the factory-*VTUZ*, these proposals are a repetition of what had been said in well-known Party and government resolutions during the past two or three years. These resolutions do not remain on paper only. During 1958, industrial and technical training has been a part of the curriculum in 3,000 secondary schools in the R.S.F.S.R.[53] and 3,452 schools in the Ukrainian S.S.R.[54] Something along these lines is now also being done in the schools of all the other republics. But one must be a great optimist to believe Khrushchev that these measures will make it possible for Soviet youth to achieve their rights to higher education in sufficient measure.

The latest Soviet law has set forth a project for the reform of secondary education by the establishment of an eight-year school as the universal compulsory school for children of seven to fifteen, rather than the ten-year school proposed by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. Beginning with the fifth year, the pupils of this school are to combine the general course in the fundamentals of their various subjects with work in student workshops, experimental stations, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. This primary eight-year school is to serve as the basis for the secondary general educational school, which will include trade instruction in various fields. As reported,[55] the major part of these schools

is to be established on a part-time basis, in connection with industrial, construction, and transport enterprises, and in rural areas, in connection with kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and repair and technical stations.

The secondary schools are thus to become something like apprenticeship-training shops of a given enterprise, training skilled workers, junior technical personnel, workers with general mechanical skills, livestock breeders, agriculturists, etc. Each of these schools is to have approximately the following departments: physio-technical, chemico-technical, natural sciences, and agronomic, as well as a department of humanities. In addition, secondary schools with instruction in music, art, etc. are to be set up (evidently in the big cities). In comparison with the present secondary schools, their term of study is to be increased by one year. In other words, the complete secondary school will have eleven classes instead of ten. In addition to matriculation certificates, the graduates of these schools will receive certification of the labor skills they have acquired. A reorganization of the system of public education in the R.S.F.S.R. has begun with the current school year and will be completed within five to seven years. Such reforms are also being introduced in the other Union republics.[56]

2. Polytechnical Education and the New Soviet School Reforms

by RICHARD V. RAPACZ

The Nineteenth Party Congress speeches and exhortations offered the first indications of an impending change in the goals and techniques of academic training of Soviet youth. The broad and sweeping nature of this change reflects anxiety over a serious flaw in an educational system that, quite ironically, was much admired by observers in the West after the successful launching of the Soviet earth satellites. As discussion, debate, and denunciation gradually increased after 1952, it became apparent that the traditional scientific and classical orientation of the Soviet educational scheme was about to be shifted significantly. The schools were to lose their primary function of preparation for higher education in favor of preparation for work in the production lines and "grain factories" of the Soviet economy.

This new vocational training has received the embellishing label of polytechnical education, since Soviet planners have long decried vocationalism in education as a capitalist intrigue to perpetuate the subjugation of the working classes. By a process of dialectical mental gymnastics, Soviet planners believe polytechnical education to be in harmony with Communist ideology. To them, it is a method of scientific enlightenment of the proletariat with sound theoretical foundations, simultaneously providing practical familiarization with the basic techniques of production and an infusion of a love for manual labor. This

concept of education, hardly a new Soviet theoretical development, was formulated many years before the October Revolution.

Historical Review

Before 1917, education was viewed by the Marxists as a tool of the bourgeoisie for throttling any possible tendencies of this activity toward increasing social mobility. Education in Tsarist Russia was primarily an elitist, traditionally oriented system with high academic standards which left an intellectual heritage to the Communists. Although access to education was gradually increased, the low literacy rate offered testimony that educational opportunity was seriously limited. Universal education was demanded and promised by the Marxists who were concerned not only with literacy, per se, but with technological literacy. Marx had envisioned education in the form of three elements: the physical, the mental, and the technical. The technical element is defined as polytechnical and was intended to familiarize the student with the basic principles of production and the tools of production processes. Marx developed this idea from the educational theories of Robert Owen and his "factory-school" practices of the early nineteenth century, which were to combine "children's education with productive labor."[1]

At the end of the nineteenth century, Lenin wrote his first defense of the Marxian concept of polytechnization in a reply to Yuzhakov, member of the Narodniks, a revolutionary group which completely "misconstrued" socialist development. In his reply, "Gems of the Narodniks' Hare-Brained Schemes," he outlined the basic plan for post-revolutionary Communist education for more than a decade. The plan was to provide a universal, compulsory worker's school, which would give its pupils "serious" knowledge as well as practical work experience. The article, written only a few years after he had met Krupskaya, reveals her profound influence in shaping Lenin's theories on polytechnical education.[2]

Lenin wrote little more about education until the end of World War I and the Revolution. In 1917, he suggested that Krupskaya, now his wife, prepare a book on polytechnical education which he was to have published. This work, *People's Education and Democracy*, was among the first published on education after the Revolution and, quite naturally, was influential in establishing the direction of educational policy. From the very beginnings of the Soviet regime, Lenin insisted that the People's Commissariat of Education provide polytechnical schools, and his 1917 Party program called for "free and compulsory, general and polytechnical (theoretical and practical in all the principal branches of industrial production) education for girls and boys below the age of sixteen."[3] In 1919, the Communist Party officially recognized the concept of polytechnical education and proclaimed that Soviet schools were to provide such education for all up to the age of seventeen.[4] Many difficulties foreshadowed the lowering of the unrealistic upper age limit to the age of fifteen in 1921. Krupskaya wrote that, from the beginning, the program for polytechnization could not be fully implemented. Lathes, milling machines, tractors, threshers, and even the most basic tools of industry and agriculture could not be spared for instructional purposes. Opposition arose to the entire concept and it was maintained by many educators that polytechnical education was unnecessary and wasteful. They felt that the needs of the country could be met more efficiently by highly specialized technical education. Even under such pressures, the concession of the lowering of the upper age limit to fifteen was made by Lenin only with the stipulation that this move would be considered a temporary economic measure. His conviction that the polytechnical school would lay the foundations of the classless society is again confirmed in the elaborate plans for polytechnization of schools in the Central Committee directives of 1921. These ideas dominated the experimental era in Soviet education until its end in 1931.[5]

A vast complex of economic and social forces was responsible for the collapse of the scheme for polytechnization of schools in

1931. Although the idea was consistent with Communist ideology, the values which shaped the traditional philosophy of education still prevailed. The schools had been viewed for decades as training institutions for white-collar positions and not as factory schools for laborers. The traditionally oriented educators and public could not be expected to react with favor to an idea that was to transform schools into laboratories for Communist experiments in education. As a consequence, many teachers would not or could not develop the new, experimental approach in methods that polytechnical education demanded. The polytechnical scheme was conducive to loose, decentralized administration of education, since schools usually taught those skills which best served local industries. The critics felt that educational policy should be determined by firm central authority during the formative years of the Communist state.

In the early thirties, a return to the traditional educational philosophy was accompanied by a note of dissatisfaction in an address by Stalin at a workers' conference in 1931: "We are lagging fifty to one hundred years behind the advanced countries," and, "we must win this distance in ten years or we will be crushed."[6] This message was a graphic portrayal of the task of the Soviet economy and the schools began the training of an army of basic research workers to overhaul and redesign the machinery and tools of Soviet industrial plants. Incorrect practices of polytechnical education, in spite of Lenin's warnings against "trade schoolism," had been responsible for the failure to prepare "fully literate persons who have a good mastery of scientific fundamentals."[7] This pronouncement by the Party's Central Committee in 1931 was the first official indication that polytechnical education was to become a subdued concept for a period of twenty years. New interpretations of Marxist-Leninist theory, imperative under the one-man rule of Stalin, also contributed to the closing of the permissive period in Soviet education. Curriculum changes reflected the mood for plans for tight centralization of administrative control of education throughout the vast expanse of the Soviet republics. Geared to the need for

research specialists, the curriculum emphasized the easily administered subjects rather than the practical subjects that dominated the schools of the twenties. Primary and secondary schools all over the Soviet Union adopted the same inflexible curriculum designed by the Russian Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. With the stress on industrial research as well as on basic research in preparation for the coming war, the expansion of technical institutes and universities foreshadowed the entrenchment of the educational philosophy that was to transform the primary, incomplete secondary, and secondary schools into preparatory institutions for higher education.

New Developments

On October 8, 1952, the Report on the Directives of the Nineteenth Party Congress hinted at a rediscovery of the concept of polytechnization. Only one short paragraph offered a clue to the trend which was to dominate Soviet educational thought and eventually lead to the changes proposed in 1958: "To further increase the part played by the general school in socialist education and to ensure pupils completing secondary school a free choice of profession, a start is to be made in introducing polytechnical training in secondary schools, while the ground will be prepared for the transition to universal polytechnical training."[8]

This brief pronouncement undoubtedly left many Soviet educators puzzled about, and fearful of commenting on, the proposed plan. It was not until after the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences released a joint publication on polytechnization in 1953, that discussion and debate of the issues began to mount.[9] Well-channeled complaints, selected for publication in the *samokritika* columns of the Soviet press, decried a number of obstacles to vigorous implementation of the new program, such as lack of direction from educational authorities, the lack of shop equipment, and the lack of properly trained teachers. The inability or reluctance to speed up the program in the face of

compelling pressures was undoubtedly responsible for a growing frustration among planners of Soviet educational policy.[10]

Khrushchev, in his Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, began to use Lenin's slogans for developing Socialist education. Lenin, during an assault on education in capitalist countries, held that such "education divorced from life and politics is a hypocrisy and a lie."[11] It is not accidental that Khrushchev in the Twentieth Party Congress address echoed Lenin in his statement of dissatisfaction with the slowness in the implementation of polytechnization and thus voiced the sharpest criticism of education available in Soviet literature: "A big shortcoming of our school system is that instruction is 'divorced from life' to some extent; those who finish schools are insufficiently prepared for practical work. Although the directives of the Nineteenth Party Congress called for measures to introduce polytechnical instruction in the schools, this matter is moving ahead very slowly." His assault also contained a condemnation of the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences for too many "words" and not enough "deeds." The speech outlined a program for education that suggested the introduction of new subjects in the fundamentals of technology and production, part-time labor in factories, and construction of school workshops and experimental plots. The report foreshadowed the need for practical training, "since no small number of those leaving school will at once start to work in various branches of the national economy."[12]

After this sharply worded stimulus, the plan for a program of polytechnization began to take shape slowly, but the fact that there was much confusion is made clear by the series of disconnected attempts to accelerate the program rapidly. Provisions were made for adding practical subjects to the 1957-58 curriculum. Some attempts were made to introduce part-time work as an educationally functional portion of the school day.[13] Fifty experimental schools appeared in the Russian Republic under the auspices of the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.

These experimental schools extended primary and secondary education over an eleven- and twelve-year period. Further years were added in order to experiment with curricula which were to combine actual experience in production with academic and vocational training in the last three or four years of the secondary phase of the educational program.[14] That these efforts were largely experimental is made evident by the increased appearance of impatient criticism in the Soviet press.

At the Thirteenth Komsomol Congress, on April 18, 1958, Khrushchev again attacked the Soviet schools as being "divorced from life" and its graduates as "ignorant of production." Khrushchev assailed the attitudes of many parents as disrespectful to physical labor and stated that he would "not even talk about the fact that such reasoning is insulting to the toilers of a Socialist society." The speech, later enlarged upon in Khrushchev's September Memorandum of the same year, lapsed into a tirade against parental intrigues to assure the entrance of their children into institutions of higher learning, but revealed in very broad terms a number of proposals that explained the extent and direction of the polytechnization program. The proposals, already alluded to in the preceding essay, included: (1) revision of the curriculum toward a practical, vocational orientation in order to inculcate a love of physical labor and to prepare students for participation in labor rather than for university entrance; (2) selection for secondary vocational training and entrance to institutions of higher learning to be determined largely by Komsomol and trade-union recommendations; (3) increase of "factory-colleges" and industrial training centers for secondary and higher education; (4) geographical relocation of agricultural and industrial training centers to localities where their students could be selected from nearby areas and could find work in their specialty in those areas after completing their training, or perform part-time labor while still in training; (5) increase of facilities for correspondence and part-time education at the secondary and higher educational level, taking care that such training is not entirely academic.[15] This speech, like the report to

the Twentieth Party Congress, acted as a stimulus to increased discussion. The R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences worked to produce a clear-cut plan from the suggestions and debate that followed the proposals.

This plan was not made public until the Party Central Committee theses on education were revealed in *Pravda* and *Izvestia* on November 16, 1958. Indications of what the plan would include appeared in Soviet literature during the intervening period and contained evidence that a political and bureaucratic scuffle was complicating the formulation of the plan. The program appeared to be taking the form of a two-phase system of education. The first phase was to consist of a basic eight-year school that would provide academic training, elementary work habits, and some polytechnical knowledge. Students would begin in this school at the age of seven or eight and then would enter the second phase through a selective streaming process into schools for rural and working youth, technical schools attached directly to industries or agricultural training centers, labor reserve technical schools, and schools for talented specialists. It is in the second phase, which demands cooperation among educational, political, and industrial agencies, that the most serious problems for polytechnization arise. The problem of inducing industries to assume responsibility for supplying equipment and personnel for polytechnical training was undoubtedly responsible for the criticism of the eleven-year program by Khrushchev's newly created regional economic councils. The Labor Reserve Board, once an organization responsible for education of slow learners and incorrigibles, emerged during this period of discussion as an organization that appeared to be serving as a mediating body among educators, politicians, and industrialists. The Vologda, Ryazan, Chelyabinsk, and Belorussian economic councils, for example, were soundly condemned in *Komsomolskaya pravda*, June 10, 1958, for not responding properly to the problems of training and placing of young specialists.[16] I. A. Kairov, President of the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, was able to present a somewhat more detailed picture of the new program

in *Pravda* on September 6, 1958, but admitted that many major problems of the plan were unresolved such as: (1) variances in the educational program according to different regional demands, and (2) organization of the second phase, and the related problems of linking schools to work in production, along the lines of the Schools for Working and Rural Youth and the agricultural and factory technical schools. The most significant revelations of this article were worded in a predictive fashion and concerned the increase in the number of boarding schools, greater educational policy determination by Union republics and local Soviet agencies, and the establishment of schools for children who were talented in mathematics and other sciences.[17]

A few days later, on September 10, 1958, *Komsomolskaya pravda* featured a lengthy article by A. I. Zelenko, director of the Labor Reserves Administration. Zelenko's proposals were directed toward an increase in urban and rural labor-reserve technical schools that would train the main stream of eight-year school graduates. These schools would provide part-time, evening, and correspondence training of a highly specialized nature to students working almost full-time in industry. Zelenko openly condemned the scheme advocated by "some workers in education" as impractical. It is clear that he was referring to the program which Kairov outlined a few days earlier. The main criticisms were: (1) modern industry demands highly trained technicians, and a program that would allow only a few days of work in factory brigades would not provide highly skilled workers; (2) the age of students graduating from the first phase of the program would be such that these students could not legally receive training in branches of industry which do not employ people under eighteen years of age; (3) many communities have a single specialized industry with no facilities for training in other specialties; (4) experimental schools have tended to shift vocational training onto industrial enterprises; (5) a student might occupy the place of a skilled worker for years and the interests of the enterprise would hardly be well served; and (6) economic

planning for manpower distribution, training, and placement would become too complex.[18]

Discussion of the polytechnization program, prior to the Khrushchev September Memorandum to the Presidium of the Party Central Committee, centered on administrative organization of the second phase. The conflicting positions taken by the Labor Reserve Administration and regional economic councils on one side, and the educational agencies on the opposing side, evidently were still not solved when the Memorandum, entitled "On the Strengthening of Ties Between School and Life and the Further Development of Public Education in the Country," appeared in *Pravda* and *Izvestia* on September 21, 1958. These issues were vaguely glossed over, but it was apparent that Khrushchev emphasized the proposals of Zelenko and suggested various measures that might be taken to overcome some of the difficulties that were indicated in implementing the program outlined by Kairov. Age-limit barriers to industrial employment were to be removed so that problems of job placement of eight-year school graduates would be more easily solved. Reserving jobs for these students was an assignment to be handed over to the U.S.S.R. State Planning Committee for long-range consideration. Varying conditions in each economic region were to receive adequate attention. The Khrushchev proposals appear to be an uneasy solution of an administrative conflict that evidently was to be soft-pedaled in the press after the appearance of the Memorandum. A new focal issue was to appear, undoubtedly because of the attention given to it in the Memorandum. This issue, concerned with the establishment of special schools for scientifically talented students, contains many contradictions to the reasons offered for the introduction of polytechnical education. Khrushchev's main argument for a special program for the training of gifted students is that no interruptions should be permitted in the training of specialists for the nation's economy.[19]

On October 17, 1958, an article in *Pravda* by Academician N. N. Semenov offered extensive arguments for the creation of

special schools for the scientifically talented.[20] These arguments stressed the need for institutions of higher learning to draw directly on the secondary schools for their main enrollment. This need is described as extremely important since scientific creativity is dependent on the youthful mind as it is guided in continuous, uninterrupted study. Many critics responded to the Semenov article and pointed out the inconsistencies in the rationale for a program for gifted children within a program for polytechnical education that was designed to instill a love of physical labor in all Soviet youth. When the Council of Ministers and the Party Central Committee theses on education appeared in *Pravda*, on November 16, 1958, very little space was devoted to the vague description of the program for the training of the gifted, indicating that this problem had not yet been resolved.[21]

The theses, which bear the same title as the Khrushchev September Memorandum, recommend the same broad program outlined during the discussion following Khrushchev's speech to the Thirteenth Komsomol Congress. The two-phase pattern of an eight-year school for basic polytechnical education, followed by a selection for various forms of specialized secondary education, has been definitely established in the plan. One group would enter technical vocational schools for a one- or two-year course, and some students would be trained in workers' brigades at factories or farms. These students would complete their second-year school training by attending part-time and correspondence schools for working and rural youth while employed in useful labor. A second group would follow the three-year program established in the experimental schools. Two-thirds of the time spent in these schools would be devoted to general and polytechnical education. A third group would enter technicums and technical institutes either immediately after graduation from the eight-year school or after spending some time at work. A fourth group would enter special schools for the training of children gifted in mathematics, biology, physics, music, art, and the ballet. The tenor of the recommendations of the Party Central Com-

mittee and the Council of Ministers was such that ample provision was made for discussion and revision of the plan before the Supreme Soviet convened to enact a school reform law in December, 1958.

On Christmas Day, 1958, *Pravda* printed the school reform law which had been passed by the Supreme Soviet on the previous day.[22] The law, bearing virtually the same title as the Khrushchev September Memorandum and the Central Committee theses, contains approximately the same provisions as the two earlier documents. The basic eight-year general polytechnical school is to be followed by secondary education of the types recommended earlier, with one notable exception. Schools for the gifted were not specifically mentioned, although the wording of the law was such that it is conceivable that such schools could exist within the framework of the law. In any event, it is probable that exceptionally talented or influential students would receive individual preferential treatment, particularly in the schools of the experimental eleven-year type, and even in the special technical schools. Such schools could be authorized to provide a curriculum that is not geared to training for local industrial needs, and which, therefore, could soft-pedal the mandatory work training prescribed in the law. The legally required Komsomol and labor supervisor recommendations for university entrance would not be difficult to obtain in communities which have schools with a large proportion of students of wealthy or influential parentage.

It is significant that provisions for special schools for the talented were not specifically written into law, despite the strong support given to such proposals by respected Soviet scholars. That such schools would be ideologically anomalous in the proposed educational scheme is clear, but that loopholes in the law could provide *de facto* recognition of the demand for such schools is also clear. Zelenko's proposals, and to some degree Khrushchev's also, were modified in the law as a result of the pressures brought to bear by the more conservative educators and by the "new class" elements of Soviet society. The fact that the reform

is not to be fully implemented until 1962-63 is another indication of a victory of more conservative forces and may reveal the extent to which the spirit of the law will not be obeyed even then.

Interpretation

The philosophical basis for the return to polytechnical education is outlined in the writings of Marx on the subject of education. If the formal education of the Stalin era had its roots in a Czarist educational heritage, then the need for the development of an educational program that germinated in the ideological periods of Marx, Lenin, and Krupskaya is self-evident. That Soviet ideology is in need of the spiritual stimulus which polytechnical education is to provide, at least theoretically, is revealed in the criticism made by Khrushchev of the attitudes and values of Soviet youth and of their parents. Increased individual wealth and the promise of more to come have done much to dull enthusiasm for egalitarian ideals. The need for emphasis of such ideals has been aggravated by two decades of traditional education and the values which such education inculcated in Soviet youth.

The need to bring the school closer to the Leninist concept of "life" reawakened the scheme of polytechnical education. Student participation in industrial production, through manipulation of theoretical problems of production as well as manipulation of tools and machinery in actual labor, is designed to encourage a love of physical work. It is difficult to conceive how such a plan can be effective in promoting the identification of Soviet youth with the "Soviet toiler," since a conflicting system of social and economic rewards established in Czarist days has survived to the present. It is easier to conceive that this scheme, instead of reducing class distinctions by demanding that everyone engage in physical labor, would heighten the desire of many to escape physical labor by striving more earnestly for white-collar positions. This problem could only be eliminated if polytechnical education is considered as a potential prelude to the elimination

of the socio-economic advantages of presently preferred types of labor. Khrushchev more than hinted that the perpetuation of social status in successive generations would be made more difficult by increasing the influence of Komsomols and labor supervisors in the selection of applicants for higher educational institutions. If the present system of status advantages persists, and there appears to be little reason why it should not, then the proposed schools, able to grant preferential treatment, will provide an excellent channel for children of influential parents to enter institutions of higher learning which do not have compulsory labor training. If this avenue is blocked, then other means certainly will be found by families in the upper strata of Soviet society to secure their children's professional future.

The conflict which has arisen between the newly created regional economic councils, the Labor Reserve Administration, and the educators appears to be linked, in part, to the political struggle between Khrushchev and the "new class" industrialists, bureaucrats, and Party chiefs. The scheme for polytechnization is undoubtedly viewed as a means of gradually eliminating a traditionally educated intelligentsia and "new class," a thorn in the side of an ideologically revitalized Party. The proposed selection system for university entrance contains provision for close Party supervision as a preventive measure against a self-perpetuating faction of "individually oriented" groups within the Party. This form of selection could also prevent the development of undesirable intelligentsia pressure groups outside the Party. However, polytechnization could easily increase socio-political unrest by thwarting the educational aspirations of many Soviet citizens.

Economically, the return to polytechnization has many common-sense foundations. The traditionally educated ten-year school graduate was not well prepared for adjusting to the life of a factory worker or farmer. Polytechnical education could prevent some of the frustrated dreams and ambitions of the young worker from interfering in efficient productive work. The Soviet labor force is beginning to feel the pangs of a low wartime birth rate just when it should be expanding to meet grandiose

economic plans, and the proposed school reform would release many potential laborers from the schools. Industrial expansion of the type envisioned by Soviet planners demands a great increase in personnel with practical training, and a traditionally educated student hardly would be suited for this type of work. The personnel for basic research has been trained and now technicians, trained in a polytechnical program, are needed to apply theory to practice. The ability and desire of industries to absorb the "costs" of polytechnical education present a serious economic problem, since the success of the program hinges in good part on the availability of machines, materials, and technical instructors. The distress of the regional economic councils has already been revealed, and the complaints of industrial enterprises will increase as the "millstone" of educational responsibility continues to hamper their planning. The regional economic councils, the Labor Reserve Administration, and the U.S.S.R. State Planning Committee are confronted with complex, probably insoluble, problems of national and regional coordination in manpower training and the supervision of the "sacrifices" of individual industrial and agricultural enterprises.

Educationally, polytechnization became inevitable as greater strides were made in achieving universal education. Increasing numbers of secondary-school graduates were unable to obtain entrance to higher schools, and the need for curriculum revision toward polytechnical education became imperative. The shift in curriculum automatically necessitated the training of teachers in new methods and the development of new textbooks and teaching materials. The problem of determining the proper balance between theoretical training and practical training has arisen. The coordination of the teaching of theoretical concepts with their practice, in proper time sequence, poses another serious question.

In the past, Soviet educators were not beset with many problems, since the traditional curriculum was narrow and comparatively simple to administer. Pedagogical techniques were largely worked out by the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences

and copied throughout the Soviet Union. Theoretically, the system was decentralized, but, in fact, the Party, through the "leadership" of the Ministry of Education in the Russian Republic and its Pedagogical Academy, was able to maintain tight centralized control and uniformity in education over the entire Union. The new plan, through economic necessity created by Khrushchev's arrangements for regional economic councils, calls for a greater degree of regional autonomy in the development of educational policy. Secondary education will usually be what agriculture or industry demands it must be in each industrial or agricultural community. A degree of central control will continue to be exercised by the formulation of the academic and theoretical portion of the curriculum through administrative channels of the Stalin era. Central control will also be maintained through the U.S.S.R. State Planning Committee, the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers' Main Labor Reserve Administration, and through Khrushchev's plan to increase Party influence on the regional economic councils.

The success of the new reforms in Soviet education does not depend solely on the abilities of Soviet pedagogues. Education has become enmeshed in the political and industrial squabbles that represent "life" in the administrative maneuverings of the Soviet bureaucracy. Even if all Soviet educators supported the new reforms, and it is clear that strong support has not come from these circles, their capacity for abrupt change in educational theory and practice, as manifested in curriculum, methods, and administration, has yet to be tested.

Paradoxically, the new reforms, forged through months of egalitarian prose and rhetoric, constitute an earlier and even more pretentious system of selection of candidates for higher education. Under the guise of equalizing attitudes toward labor in the worker's state, the "new" education will provide another means of determining who will and who will not have, and will probably sharpen class distinctions by bringing them into focus even earlier in life. It is not really strange that proposals for special schools for the gifted could emerge in the discussion preceding enactment

of the school-reform law. That such proposals were made, despite adherence to the genetic theories of Lysenko and Michurin and the Soviet philosophical postulate that all are equally educable, merely reflects the cleavage between Communist theory and Soviet practice.

3. Party Control over Soviet Schools

by JAAN PENNAR

There are many facets to the system of Soviet education. This essay will deal with only one of them—the role of the Communist Party. Soviet publications, especially the more popular ones destined for foreign consumption, barely mention the Party's role in Soviet education except as a general reference. A closer look at Soviet professional and Party journals, on the other hand, reveals a maze of Party controls over the U.S.S.R. educational system. These, however, are destined for internal consumption and more often than not point out shortcomings in Party control over education by virtue of so-called Communist *samokritika* (self-criticism). Though such revelations are scattered, a sufficient number of them can be culled from Soviet sources to provide a rough outline of the topic now to be discussed.

Life in the Soviet Union is subject to a duality in administration and control. On the one hand, there is the Soviet governmental structure which provides a parliamentary framework for Soviet society. This is the side of Soviet life which is given wide publicity. On the other hand, there exists the Communist Party apparatus which duplicates the governmental structure in almost every instance. It is the Party apparatus that wields real power in the U.S.S.R. The system of Soviet education is subject to the same duality in administration and control.

In simplest terms, the determination of policy and its execution in Soviet education is established as follows.[1] The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the

U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers jointly issue decrees or regulations pertaining to education. If a decree's importance warrants it, it may subsequently be given *pro forma* ratification by the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet (parliament) and the fifteen supreme soviets of the Union republics. Thus ratified, the decree becomes law, to be executed by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education and/or the fifteen ministries of education in as many Union republics and their subdivisions. Great changes in educational policy or the educational system, such as the program for eight years of basic schooling and subsequent work and practical training, are subject to special debate by the Party's Central Committee before implementation. This procedure needs no further elaboration since it is generally known. It should be stressed, nevertheless, that it establishes the Communist Party or, more properly, its Central Committee, as an initiator of policy. In more ways than one, however, the Party appears to be the executor as well.

There is no more obvious proof of Party control than the persons who hold important posts in both the Party and the educational administration.[2] The U.S.S.R. Minister of Higher Education, V. P. Yelyutin, has been an alternate member of the Party's Central Committee since 1956 and before that a member of the Party's Central Auditing Commission. Ivan Andreevich Kairov, president of the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and as such in charge of initiating and testing educational policies, is a current member of the Central Auditing Commission and a former alternate member of the Party's Central Committee. For eight years, until 1957, Kairov was the Minister of Education of the R.S.F.S.R., the largest of the Union republics. The present R.S.F.S.R. Minister of Education, Y. I. Afanasenko, is a member of both the Moscow City and Oblast Party Committees. In 1956, ten ministers of education in the republics were members of the Party central committees in their respective republics. Two others were alternate members, and only the Ministers of Education of the Ukraine and of Lithuania were not central committee members, which does not mean they did not hold other responsible positions in local Party hierarchies.

Aleksander Nikolaevich Nesmeyanov, President of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, has been a Communist Party member since 1944. He does not hold an important Party post, however. Ten other presidents of academies of sciences in that many republics, on the other hand, are members of their respective central committees.

Exceptions merely prove the rule. The Estonian Academy of Sciences is represented in that Republic's Central Committee by its Academician-Secretary, and in Tadzhikistan, the first Vice-President of the Academy is a member of the local Party Central Committee. The majority of the rectors of state universities in the republics are members of local Party central committees.

A little over ten years ago, Party affiliation among Soviet teachers was 34.4 per cent and among Soviet professors 25.4 per cent.[3] Membership was highest among social scientists and lowest among teachers in the technical fields. Party affiliation has increased since then. At Moscow University, the number of Party members is 3,114, of which 296 are students.[4] The University's faculty is 2,800 strong. The figures cited might therefore indicate that the whole faculty is affiliated with the Communist Party. It is more likely, however, that the non-student Party membership at Moscow University also embraces persons other than the teaching staff. Probably a better sample is provided by the city of Odessa, where, among 2,529 instructors in its higher educational institutions, about 1,500 are Communists.[5] At the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, the proportion of Party members among scientific workers is 42 per cent, among academicians 34.4 per cent, and among corresponding members 41.5 per cent.[6] Obviously, the Soviet educational system is permeated with Communist Party members. No director of a school, states a handbook on Soviet schools, can successfully supervise the education of children in the spirit of Communism unless he is himself a Communist, "be he a Party member or not."[7]

Party membership in itself does not necessarily ensure the Party's control over Soviet education. Communist activists among teachers and faculty members, of course, head primary Party

groupings at schools and universities, which make sure that a particular institution follows the Party line. There exists a more formal organization, however, to which these groupings are, in effect, subordinate. The Communist Party duplicates, as mentioned previously, the structure of the Soviet government. At every level of educational administration, therefore, the Party structure offers a parallel.

At the highest level, that of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, there are a number of Central Committee departments, among which one is designated as that of Science, Higher Educational Institutions, and Schools. The head of this Department is Vladimir Alekseevich Kirillin, who concurrently holds the post of U.S.S.R. Deputy Minister of Higher Education. Kirillin is also a member of the Party's Central Auditing Commission. The Central Committee's Bureau for R.S.F.S.R. has a Department of Science, Schools, and Culture. Its head, A. Makhov, has upbraided primary Party organizations for inadequate control over Soviet education:

> Often some leaders of Party organizations in higher educational institutions justify their passive attitude by stating that these organizations have no right to control administrative activities. But C.P.S.U. statutes in no way limit any primary Party organizations from taking the liberty of raising new questions for strengthening Party influence on all aspects of work and do not release Party organizations in higher educational institutions from responsibility for everything that is being done in these institutions.[8]

All the central committees of the fourteen non-Russian Union republics have similar school departments or separate departments for schools and others for science and higher educational institutions. In the majority of instances, the heads of these departments are also members of the Party central committees of their republics. On occasion, the head of such a department also may be the head of a republic's Supreme Soviet commission on public education, as is the case in Belorussia.[9] Special Party

departments for schools extend all the way down to the city and district level.

School-department heads in Party committees are frequent speakers at educational conferences where they often criticize shortcomings in ideological work in the social sciences, i.e. in the study of Marxism-Leninism. In this effort, they are assisted by Party departments for propaganda and agitation. In other words, the main task of the Party in the Soviet educational system is to heighten the ideological content of education. This means that "every activity, large or small, is understood and directed from the point of view of Communist ideas, Marxist science, general Party line, and the over-all tasks of Communist construction."[10]

It is difficult to draw the line, however, where guidance ends and control begins. The Smolensk Party archives graphically illustrate how the Party Oblast Committee, in 1929, ordered the communization of Smolensk State University by firing its rector and "reactionary" members of its teaching staff.[11] Although such actions are not usually reported in the Soviet press, some clues of the extent to which the Party controls educational life today may still be found.

Izvestia of August 26, 1958, reports the removal of the director of a secondary school in Kaspiisk, in Dagestan, by the City Executive Committee. Apparently the removal came about on the motion of a certain Comrade Omarov, who not only is a member of the Executive Committee, but also First Secretary of the City Party Committee. On the other hand, the director was himself a Communist who had built up considerable support for himself, which, perhaps, accounts for the resultant publicity. The director was accused of "minor omissions" in the administration of his school, and the report states the matter was one of "revenge."

Party action can be brought out into the open by means of a feuilleton published in the press. Thus *Pravda* of March 4, 1956, reported in a follow-up to a feuilleton it had published

previously that charges of financial mismanagement at the All-Union Correspondence Finance Institute in Moscow described in the previous feuilleton were true. None other but the Bureau of the Krasnogvardeisk District Party Committee in Moscow established that the charges were true. A certain Comrade Demochkin, Secretary of the Party Bureau, "who failed to take action to eliminate the serious shortcomings in the work of the Institute," was dismissed from his post. The Institute's director, together with some members of the faculty and the head bookkeeper, were also dismissed.

Another method of making Party pressure felt is to have an article by a Party official published in a Party journal. On July 25, 1956, *Kommunist* of Armenia carried an article by S. Khudoyan, in which the following question was raised: "Is it not time for the [Armenian] Ministry of Education to think seriously about a fundamental improvement in the qualifications of the teaching staffs of the primary schools?" The author proceeded by outlining in detail what should be done. In *Partiynaya zhizn,* Vladas Niunka, Secretary and Bureau member of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, called upon Communist members of school commissions to exert their influence in the selection of teaching methods in class, in the classroom preparation of teachers, and in the ideological-political education of students in class.[12]

In connection with the drive for evening and correspondence courses, the Central Committee Bureau for the R.S.F.S.R. called upon Party committees to remove "shortcomings, to raise the responsibility of directors of higher educational institutions and of enterprises, so as to establish higher education without interruptions from production, while paying special attention to the preparation of specialists."[13] School reorganization plans, i.e., eight years of basic education and then work in industry, farms, or offices together with advanced part-time study, have produced appeals from Party authorities to the effect that "poor knowledge of the real state of affairs in schools seriously lowers the chances

of Party influence thereon."[14] Party organizations are "duty-bound" to see to it that the whole network of schools is in tight relationship with enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, tractor repair stations, and machine tractor stations; they must concern themselves deeply with the formulation of labor education, take care of placing graduates, and help select instructors for production training.[15]

The Party shares in the responsibility for admitting students to higher educational institutions. The entrance commission of a university or institute, under the chairmanship of its director, must include "responsible representatives" and "leading workers" of Party organizations in the area.[16] According to the July 17, 1957, decree of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education, the competitive commissions which determine the qualifications of new faculty members must similarly include members of Party organizations with voting rights.[17]

The Party is naturally interested in textbooks, but it does more than merely approve them. Thus the publishing house "Radyanska shkola," with the help of the Science, Higher Educational Institutions, and Schools Department of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, "is carrying on important work by removing substantial shortcomings and by publishing highly valuable, solid textbooks."[18]

Social science disciplines, which are supposed to have a Marxist outlook on life and explain the current Party line, are virtually the exclusive domain of the Communist Party. Not only are almost all social science teachers members of the Party, but also everything they teach is subject to closest Party scrutiny. The Party conducts surveys, on the basis of which it issues instructions to improve the quality of study and lectures as it sees fit. With reference to a survey in the Saratov Oblast in 1957, an article in *Partiynaya zhizn* notes:

> It is the duty of the oblast Party committee to give constant assistance to the higher educational institutions in improving instruction in the social sciences and ideological work. . . .

> The Party organizations in faculties and the Party groups in departments can do much to improve the teaching skills of instructors. . . .
>
> The oblast, city, and district Party committees should increase their control over the ideological content of instruction in the social sciences. . . .
>
> The city and district Party committees, and the Party units at higher education institutions must see to it that the competitions actually aid in selecting better-qualified and abler persons for teaching positions.[19]

When Khrushchev, on September 21, 1958, presented a memorandum approved by the Presidium of the Party's Central Committee, on reorganizing Soviet schools, he started out by acknowledging the "talks" he had had on the subject with "Union republic Communist Party central committees, with secretaries of territorial and oblast Party committees, and with other comrades who are thinking about questions of public education or are directly concerned with them. . . ."

The Party's role in Soviet education is, indeed, primary. For the strengthening of its grip on Soviet education, the Party relies upon two subsidiary organizations, the Komsomol and the trade unions. The former is involved in student life and the latter embraces the teachers and the university faculty. Numerically, the Komsomol and the trade unions are among the largest organizations in the Soviet Union. On April 1, 1958, the Komsomol had a total membership of 18,092,538.[20] In higher educational institutions, Komsomol membership comprises 80 to 90 per cent of the total student body.[21] Upper Komsomol echelons are affiliated to the Party. Semichastny, First Secretary of the All-Union Komsomol until early 1959, is an alternate member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. All first secretaries of the Komsomol in Union republics are members of their respective Party central committees. Concurrent membership in the Komsomol and the Party is evident among lower echelons as well, especially among the activists. This does not

mean, however, that the great mass of Komsomol members necessarily feel loyal to the Party or to its directives. Membership in the Komsomol more often than not opens up career opportunities. Moreover, the Komsomol may occasionally also take positions contrary to Party policy.

As early as 1925, the Leningrad branch of the Komsomol passed a resolution refusing to submit to the decisions of the Fourteenth Party Congress.[22] Discontent also broke out after the death of Stalin. Currently a campaign is being waged against hooliganism and drunkenness in the ranks of the Komsomol. During the 1956 student disturbances in Georgia, the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee was accused of "not sharply and consistently opposing pernicious nationalist influences" on youth, of exercising "unsatisfactory guidance" over ideological work, and of doing a poor job of bringing up young people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.[23]

The activities of the Komsomol extend beyond the field of education. It has been organizing the "voluntary resettlement" of youth in the virgin lands of Kazakhstan and such ventures as international youth festivals. Nevertheless, its role in Soviet schools and universities is a primary one. A Party publication has defined its role in higher educational institutions as follows:

> . . . The Party bureau strives towards the [goal] that no single important question in the life of an institute should be decided without the participation of the Komsomol committee or the faculty Komsomol bureau. Currently the representatives of Komsomol organizations take part in the work of the admissions and stipend commissions, as well as in the commission for assigning final exams. The representatives of the Komsomol are included in the membership of the learned councils of the institute and of the departments and appear as constant participants in meetings with the dean.[24]

The publication adds that the "Party bureau fully directs the Komsomol organization." If Komsomol organizations do not live up to these demands they are reminded of their "right" to do so.

> In some higher educational institutions, the Komsomol organizations have made little use of their right to participate in the work of councils, departments, methodological commissions, and industrial meetings and have not introduced for discussion proposals on how to improve the teaching process.[25]

The Komsomol has been defined as an "instrument in the hand of the Party with whose help the Party exercises its influence over the large mass of youth."[26] The Party may use Komsomol meetings as a sounding board for its own criticism of the educational system. For instance, Aleksandr Nikolaevich Shelepin, First Secretary of the Komsomol until April, 1958, in addressing the 13th Komsomol Congress, stated:

> It is necessary to eliminate more rapidly the study overload of students and to carry out more boldly the reorganization of secondary schools, in accordance with Party instructions on introducing polytechnical training. It is incomprehensible why the ministries of education, and above all the Russian Republic Ministry, are slow in this matter.[27]

Along with representatives of Party organizations, representatives of the Komsomol also sit on admission commissions which recommend students for matriculation in higher educational institutions. In other words, the school would qualify the more gifted students and the Komsomol organization would certify them for admission.[28] In addition to acting as handmaiden to the Party, the Komsomol also mothers the Pioneers (the Communist children's organization). The Komsomol directs all activities of the Pioneers.[29]

Faculty members and teaching personnel are organized into trade unions of educational employees and workers. Soviet trade unions are instruments of Party policy, and trade-union membership, especially in the top echelons, extends into policy-making Party bodies. For instance, Viktor Vasilevich Grishin, Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, was a member of the Party's Central Committee before he assumed his trade-

union post in 1956. Trade unions in higher educational institutions, states a secretary of the Central Committee of the Union of Educational Workers, "must take an active part in molding the Communist outlook of students, and in this work it is necessary to utilize the knowledge, experience, authority, and personal example of the professional staff."[30]

Trade unions play an important role in universities and other higher educational institutions. They influence the choice and placement of the teaching personnel, and trade-union representatives are members of the commissions which determine the qualifications of new faculty members on a competitive basis.[31] In addition, trade-union representatives are members of the learned councils of higher educational institutions and of the departmental councils, as well as of admission commissions for new students. Upon the recommendation of the Central Committee of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education has, in a number of instances, withheld faculty appointments in several universities.[32]

Instances of Party control over Soviet education also include the planners and regional economic administrators. Educational training is largely determined by the economic goals of the country. Party managerial personnel, in charge of regional economic development, make demands upon school and university training which must be met. Several proposals have been made to merge Party organizations in schools with those of enterprises and kolkhozes which rely upon schools and institutes in their economic region for personnel.[33]

The Soviet system of education is thus subject to rigid Party control. It cannot be otherwise, since the Party directs every aspect of Soviet life. Any relaxation or local oversight is subject to criticism from Party authorities. It would seem that in recent years the Party has taken a keener interest in education, or, at any rate, this interest has lately come to the fore. It is a matter of speculation whether this trend indicates that Party membership has become more diffuse so as to include a more representative sample of Soviet population, including educators, or whether the

Party leadership is now encouraging more open discussion. What is obvious, however, has been stated by the journal *Kommunist*: "The Communist Party is the ideological and political leader of our people. Hence it is naturally also the chief educator of Soviet young people."[34]

4. Class Tensions in Soviet Education

by GEORGE Z. F. BEREDAY

There is no doubt that as a matter of ideology, and, to an extent, in practice, Soviet Communism is dedicated to the building of its own version of an equalitarian society. Yet, now that direct contact with the Soviet people is increasing, evidence of surviving and newly emerging inequalities is also multiplying. We thus witness the existence in Soviet society, not of one, but of two opposite influences. And since the legislation of equality and the attempts to arrogate inequalitarian privileges both assume acute importance at a point in which status is passed on to a new generation, these influences have a particular significance when viewed in education. It is the task of this essay to review the successes and the failures of the Soviet authorities in the tricky task of legislating equality in the classroom.

General Social Context

The equalitarian and inequalitarian tendencies in education must first be placed in a more general context. Over the years, we have been exposed to monotonous Soviet propaganda which drained Communist ideology of all but mechanical meaning. Also, the abuses of the system left room among the free nations for little else than for a feeling of revulsion. These circumstances have tended to obscure the fact that, at least in theory, Communism remains a humanitarian movement. Its basic premise is the speedy if ruthless social and economic elevation of the

underdog. Only a blind man can fail to see the appeal of such a system to the vast masses of underprivileged throughout the world. The effect of this appeal on the loyalty and happiness of the Soviet citizen is by no means negligible.

Socially and educationally, the Soviet scene today bears unquestioned and observable signs of ideological equalitarianism. The Moscow militiaman, astonishingly patiently, almost tenderly, escorting a drunk across the street, and the grumpy chauffeur in the high official's limousine are the two sides of the same social coin.[1] Through a series of provisions designed to close the gap between mental and manual occupations, through its common schools and through the now rising general standard of living, the Soviet Union has succeeded in bringing into being not only a factual, but perhaps more important, a psychological image of a more leveled society. Soviet newspapers have always carried letters and complaints against abuses by local officials, most recently and significantly against those who "separated themselves from the masses."[2] In the schools, in the streets, and even in the shopping lines, notorious for "I-was-ahead-of-you" disputes, one gets a feeling of closeness of people to one another, which is rather striking after living in an individualistic society. However little sense this makes politically, socially and educationally one cannot escape the feeling of equalitarianism which the system generates.

Yet ever since Stalin denounced "petty-bourgeois equalitarianism" we have been confronted with unmistakable signs of the emergence of a new social hierarchy. Beginning with the reappearance of the felt Stetson hat in the thirties, the predictions of Orwell's *Animal Farm* began to take shape before the eyes of an astonished world. The abandonment of the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need" and the resultant growing disparity of incomes have led not only to a return of military epaulettes, academic rank, and bureaucratic titles, but to a widespread differentiation in the standard of living. Nor is economic inequality the most significant aspect of the new situation. In the Soviet system, those in power combine

the privileges of our politicians, business captains, trade-union organizers, and academicians. It is natural that such concentration of power should favor elitism. There is no provision in the Soviet scheme other than "Party vigilance" whereby the people, the *narod*, could defend themselves against those whose absolute power includes the right of self-perpetuation. By denying even the possibility of the existence of class feelings, the theory of Soviet life has deliberately failed to develop a system of checks through which the mass could cope with this new threat to the ideals of the Revolution.

The result is the "new class." Abundant literature is now available in English to document the many aspects of the growing Soviet stratification. To quote only a few,[3] Vera Sandomirsky has drawn attention to the rising spirit of the middle class (*meshchanstvo*) and the growing distinctions between the *simple* workers (*prostoy rabochi*) and those who make a career (*probivayutsya v lyudi*).[4] A symposium published by Cyril Black contains an important section on social stratification, including Robert Feldmesser's contention that Soviet society has evolved not into many classes but into a two-class system.[5] The appearance of Milovan Djilas' *The New Class* has dramatized the contribution of ex-Communists to our understanding of the sprouting inequalities. "The heroic era of Communism is past," writes Djilas. "The epoch of its great leaders has ended. The epoch of practical men has set in. The new class has been created. It is at the height of its power and wealth, but it is without new ideas. It has nothing more to tell the people. The only thing that remains is to justify itself."[6] The idea of Platonic guardians, resurrected by Lenin, shows increasing marks of having gone the way of all other historical elites.

Side by side with the pervasive equalitarianism there are thus obvious portents of inequality in the Soviet Union. And the question asked more and more often both inside and outside the U.S.S.R. is: Which shall prevail? Not even the most ingenious statistician could assemble general enough evidence to measure the extent of the two. And qualitative insights are foredoomed to

be selective, depending on the bias of the observer. The direction into which a social structure is moving cannot be deduced from assessing the status quo. But it can be gauged from the pull of the two tendencies against each other. All inequalitarian societies provoke equalitarian revolts. Conversely, leveled structures generate inequalitarian drives. These cleavages and their reflection in specific social institutions or situations lend themselves to direct observation. The character of Soviet society, as that of other societies, can be gauged by an estimate of the intensity of its class tensions.

It is a pity that the concept of class tensions has been used to cover all forms of social unrest. Increasingly, the countries of the world sort themselves out into old and new, predominantly elitist or equalitarian. In the former, a class hierarchy is established. But the growing mass movements threaten to corrode it. In such societies, we would do well to talk of *mass ferment*, since it is the mass that is the source of disturbance. The term *class tensions* could then be used solely to characterize the problems of the essentially equalitarian societies. In them, the overall leveled pattern tends to be disturbed by the rise of new groups anxious to secure a more than average share of general privileges. Such a model would fit the present Soviet scene well. The equalitarian foundations, successfully established through Communist insistence on doctrinal unanimity and planning, are now affected by the social hierarchy brought into being by the urgencies of enforced industrialization. As Alex Inkeles put it:

> The occupational structure is so important a focus in contemporary large-scale social systems that occupational status can serve very largely to determine the general social status of individuals. It requires only the appearance of distinctive patterns of speech, manners, and dress, differential patterns of association, and social group consciousness, to lay the foundation of a system of stratification based on social-class groupings.[7]

It is precisely the class significance of "distinctive patterns of speech, manners, and dress" in the Soviet Union that brings the

study of the education which shapes and nourishes them into central focus.

Equality in Education

In ideology and organization the Soviet school is equalitarian. The Communists have made an obvious effort to create an atmosphere of fraternal closeness among schoolmates and teachers alike. They have established a framework of organization and administrative practice to ensure the maintenance of such an atmosphere. As a result, the schools, more perhaps than other Soviet institutions, strike one as close-knit, harmonious communities. Even in the area of grading, a harsh and selective system of distinctions that could become social in character as a result of medal awards and differential stipend policies, one is impressed not by invidiousness, but by what seems to be a genuine cooperative effort exemplified somewhat incongruously: outside the classroom—by coaching; and inside—by prompting of the weaker students by their classmates. The fraternal feelings, successfully created first by the incessant preaching of collectivism, and secondly by the structure that supports it, have brought into being an equalitarian basis in Soviet education.

The Soviet schools are so strongly dedicated to the teaching of ideology that equalitarian ideas inevitably receive a respected place in school policy. Education was and is conceived as definitely social in its purposes. Its aim is to annihilate class differences, to do away with the psychological feelings of inferiority and superiority that separate different groups of people. Communist education preaches the end of an age of exploitation and the advent of universal recognition of the dignity of human labor. This ideological premise continues to be one of the cornerstones of Soviet educational theory.

Seldom if ever is equality (*uravnenie*) mentioned explicitly. But the whole atmosphere of ideological exhortation favors its attainment. Soviet educational sources stress the virtues of decency, individual worth, hard work, and cooperation. Through

school indoctrination as well as through the many-sided channels of Soviet propaganda, they hope to condition Soviet youngsters to assimilate these values.

> Communist principles, taken in elementary form, are the principles of highly educated, honest, advanced people; they are love for one's socialist motherland, friendship, comradeship, humanity, honesty, love for socialist labor, and a great many other universally understood lofty qualities. The nurturing, the cultivation of these attitudes, of these lofty qualities, is the most important element of Communist education.[8]

By preparing for collective life in a socialist society and by stressing the attainment of individual happiness through sublimation in work for the community, Soviet educators have attempted to create an equalitarian atmosphere among their teachers and students.

> For educators in Soviet schools, the most important goal is the collective of pupils, and their individuality within that collective. Soviet educators take great care to ensure the unity of the collective, the coherence of its activities, the selfless and friendly cooperation of the children, and the creation of conditions for the full development of the precious individuality of each student. The teachers rely on the collective in the task of education, at the same time being aware that this device will be most fully effective when the students will regard their collective as their own independent organization.[9]

Feelings such as these color the whole pedagogical enterprise. In view of the pervasive hold which Soviet ideological preachings have upon the people, they cannot fail to mold successfully the attitudes of children at school.

But equality in education is not only a matter of ideology. The Communist theory does not take any chances. It never neglects the legislation of institutions which, through compulsion if need be, enforce the doctrine when persuasion has failed. In addition to thought control, the organization of education, too, has been determined by equalitarian considerations. In particular,

three factors—the creation of comprehensive schools, the common curriculum, and the specific Soviet attitudes on coeducation —have had a great and even perhaps increasing leveling significance.

The Soviet Union is second only to the United States in its adherence to the principle of common schools. It has legislated a school organization of a single comprehensive type designed to take in children of all backgrounds and aptitudes. There are, of course, exceptions. Practice has forced the authorities to create several parallel school types, even at the primary-school level (such as the ballet or military schools), to provide for needed specialization. At the secondary-school level, too, the old senior *Srednyaya shkola*, though comprehensive in principle, was not only never universal, but was not even a school for the majority, since it educated less than half of the age group. By providing for three major types of schools for students past the age of fifteen, the new reforms have in fact confined the comprehensive principle to primary education, not to surpass the dimensions of, say, the German *Volksschule*. But these practical limitations have never prevented the authorities from claiming adherence to the comprehensive principle at all school levels. As *Komsomolskaya pravda* put it:

> Forty years have passed since the establishment of Soviet power. For a long time there have been in the Soviet Union neither landowners, nor capitalists, nor class antagonisms. Our real enemies are far beyond the curtain. All of our young people were born under socialism, *all were taught in the same Soviet schools* [italics added], and all are working people.[10]

The expectation of the privilege of common schooling is firmly ingrained in the popular image. The postwar ambition to expand the range of secondary education seems to have been accompanied by a refusal to stream pupils, hence the swelling of numbers of graduates of general secondary schools, and hence, also, the pressures for the expansion of places at schools,

universities, and institutes. It is these pressures that prompted the enactment of the December, 1958, educational reform, the net result of which will be to make access to upper schools more difficult. Such a law could not be popular with the school-hungry contingents. But as long as it applied to *all*, there was to be little opposition.

No sooner were explicit proposals made to exempt *some* children from its operation, however, when something like a general revolt of public opinion set in, perhaps for the first time. It is enough to refer to the proposals for the education of gifted children, argued before the enactment of the law, to get a sense of the commitment of the Soviet people to the principle of comprehensive education for all. We need only select as an example the bold and outspoken criticism by I. Ivanenko, a member of the Union of Educational and Scientific Workers, of the proposals for the selection of the gifted made by Nicholai Goncharov and Alexis Leontiev of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences,[11] to gauge the measure of dislike of the idea of selective education by Soviet society. The fact that such voices of dissent to the Academy program were allowed probably indicates the sympathy of the authorities for them. In any case, it is an index of the strength of general leveler feelings. In 1956, the newly created boarding schools miraculously turned out to be of an equalitarian rather than, as announced, of an elitist character.[12] In 1958, equally miraculously, all mention of the provision for the gifted was left out of the final draft of the law, in spite of the fact that it had appeared in an earlier draft, and despite the fact that the authorities will have to face the necessity of preserving some continuity in the flow of students in pre-university education in the future. It is not unreasonable to deduce from these facts the extent of popular attachment to the idea of a comprehensive school system.

In the establishment of common schools, Soviet educators could draw upon precedents in the West. But their insistence on the second equalitarian feature, a unified identical curriculum for all students, is their own unique pedagogical contribution.

Soviet school programs originate in the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, which is technically attached to the R.S.F.S.R. Ministry of Education, and thus is without jurisdiction in other republics. Yet an identical school timetable is observed throughout the Soviet Union, adopted, it is argued, voluntarily in all the other republics. Soviet educators will tell one with some pride that, unlike in France, where a celebrated minister of education boasted that the same lesson was placed each day before each French school age group, in the Soviet Union there may be as much as five days' disparity in the different regions between the time the same lesson comes up in each classroom. With the exception of native-language teaching, which varies with each republic, and aside from newly anticipated changes, all Soviet school children, irrespective of ability, location, or climate, are currently offered an identical curriculum.

This refusal to diversify the curriculum is derived from the Party insistence on the correct theory of heredity. Soviet "defectologists," for instance, can still be heard asserting that handicaps such as blindness or deafness cannot be a result of heredity but rather of the damage the foetus suffered during birth or pregnancy. But now differences in innate abilities are no longer denied, and Soviet theorists argue instead that their spread can be narrowed substantially by deliberate manipulation of the environment. Thus the psychologist A. R. Luria speaks of the principle of "compensation." A child with slower comprehension can overcome his handicap by extra training of his memory, a child with poor memory can develop a fast method of note taking, etc.[13] In this way, it is claimed, the range of ability can always be narrowed down to a point at which all children are capable of following the same curriculum. There is an obvious equalitarian premise behind such arguments and the resulting curricular practice.

But there is yet another unspoken equalitarian assumption behind a unified curriculum. Soviet pedagogy inherited from Czarist times and their Western antecedents a vast respect for fundamentals, the *"obschee obrazovanie."* This means that at-

tainment of a definite level of education has great cultural meaning, particularly to the socially mobile in each generation. All those who wind up in the new class are, therefore, most likely to put a great stress on being cultured (*kulturnye*). It is thus an automatic defense of the framers of a Communist state to insist that the masses should also be *kulturnye*. The preservation of a culture and a language common to both the leaders and the led is an insurance, a hedge against the social gulf that threatens the society in which power rests so exclusively in the hands of a literate bureaucracy.

Coeducation and the extraordinary attitudes toward girls and women represent the third equalitarian feature of Soviet school practice. There is little doubt that the Soviet Union is at present a country with a substantial degree of equality between the sexes. There is also little doubt that the schools have made a major contribution toward bringing about this social result. Even when coeducation was temporarily suspended in Soviet schools during World War II, Soviet educators admitted that it was introduced originally so that women could secure equality of rights, but now "complete social equality of the sexes is defined and fixed in the Stalin Constitution," thus rendering coeducation unnecessary.[14] The subsequent return to coeducation and the equality of treatment accorded to girls seem to have vindicated the prewar attitudes. As a result, in today's Soviet schools, boys and girls are usually paired on double benches. They not only study and do chores together, but also have common classes in physical education and even play common games. They are thus obviously prepared for an adult society in which jobs, entertainment, and political honors are more equally distributed among the sexes than in many other societies.

Not that the battle of the sexes does not continue. "Marry once, even if it is an onion and your tears flow," admonishes a Soviet saying. The total absence of suggestive sex literature in Soviet life has aided in maintaining the prerevolutionary primness which adds overtones of "untouchability" to the atmosphere of

closeness and even tenderness in relations between boys and girls in schools. In the boarding school, boys' and girls' dormitories face each other across the corridor, but the teachers and tutors feel no compunction in leaving the building at 10 P.M., with only one tutor on duty. Equality of sexes in Soviet school practice has meant both physical closeness and moral distance, the same treatment but with a difference. It may well be that the introduction of sewing and cooking classes and the growing insistence of women on lighter jobs will eventually tip the scales in favor of the difference. But at present, a sense of sex partnership unquestionably pervades Soviet schools and society.

The comprehensive school structure, common curriculum, and coeducation are thus the three pillars of educational equalitarianism. Besides these, there exists a host of other well-known provisions, all designed to reinforce its often unsteady basis.

Thus it is obvious that in addition to their predilection for a comprehensive setting, the Soviet people have also set their hearts on the universality of educational opportunity (*obrazovanie dostupno dlya vsekh*). Since the Revolution, in the absence of consumer comforts of all kinds, education was proffered by the state and accepted by the people as the compensatory avenue of opportunity. In the twenties, we witnessed a passion for literacy campaigns. The thirties and forties brought forth the claims for primary education for all. Early in the fifties came the announcement of plans for secondary ten-year education for all, now modified to eight years of compulsory study with unlimited opportunity for part-time, eleven-year schooling. The Soviet press complains continuously about absenteeism and stresses the necessity for vigorous countermeasures.

> The officials of local Soviets should regard universality of education as one of the most important parts of their responsibility. With the aid of the Communist Party and government organizations, it is imperative to obtain opportunities to build new dormitories, to enlarge the groups studying a full day shift, to increase the funds for training all in each school, to

> protect the health of the students through adequately heated classrooms, to organize transportation to schools. This is especially important now in the period of winter cold weather.[15]

The article from which this quotation was taken is only one of many which urge the cause of education for all children.

It is equally clear that Soviet practice not only insists on a common, unified academic curriculum, but that it also attempts to upgrade the status of manual work and preparation. The present polytechnization movement[16] is wholly directed toward the much-repeated, but nevertheless eloquent ideal of "connection between school and life." Schools for rural and urban youth, now to be expanded greatly, have attempted to give young people already employed in manual jobs the desirable academic veneer; their teachers are now clamoring for higher pay.[17] Boarding schools increasingly take up neglected cases, among them (by compulsion) children of parents who are still illiterate. The cultivation of respect for manual work is a central dogma, almost an obsession, of the Communist doctrine. Thus in a school in Alma Ata one can hear the principal proudly pointing out that the greatest punishment in his school is to forbid the culprit to do chores alongside his classmates. In a Sverdlovsk school, children declaim a poem about a domestic servant "whom nobody thanked for her work before the Revolution, but now she is thanked and people are kind to her." Khrushchev's fulminations against graduates of agricultural schools, who "cannot tell the difference between young hemp and nettles unless they are stung by the nettles," and who "will be afraid when a cow shakes her head,"[18] emphasize the efforts of the Communists to equalize by upgrading. Everything that is done in the Soviet schools is intended to mean, even under (now receding) formalism, that manual work is sacred.

Also, in addition to and as an extension of the policy of bringing about some degree of sex equality, the Soviets have attempted to effect, partly through education, a more far-reaching reshuffling of occupational prestige patterns. This is best seen in the professional fields. Medicine, for instance, has been brought

down to the social level of the teaching profession. The same might be true of lawyers (as distinct perhaps from judges), who seem to be, by comparison with the West at least, considerably reduced in status. By contrast, the position of engineers has been notably upgraded. Some unusually productive workers, the Stakhanovites, have been elevated to high social status without moving out of their occupations. On the other hand, with the help of low incomes and the subjection to labor laws, a vast mass of white-collar clerks deliberately has been prevented from developing the class consciousness of the suburban lower middle class. Also, the living conditions of the workers and peasants have been modified by industrialization, not always for the worse. But urban housing and living conditions, for the most part of white-collar character, have been allowed to deteriorate. The working classes, and to some extent the peasants also, have received a boost in their status by the Revolution carried out in their name. By contrast, the prewar intelligentsia was persecuted and its postwar successors regarded with suspicion for a decade and a half. Women were admitted freely to all occupations and were probably the cause rather than the beneficiaries of the downgrading of some professions. They are, after all, much more numerous in medicine and teaching than in engineering. In addition, of course, they have also monopolized the lowest occupations, such as that of streetsweeper. As Kenneth Galbraith aptly put it:

> I noticed an old woman with a broom of sticks sweeping the streets. For many years I have been reading about these women, and, at long last, I felt that I had made spiritual contact with the Slavic world. I also reflected that having old women sweep the streets is greatly inferior to our system of not sweeping them at all.[19]

But these examples notwithstanding, there is little doubt that there has occurred a significant equalization of the professions in the Soviet Union, and that the school situation is positively interconnected with these changes.

The educational features discussed above support the equali-

tarian blueprint of the Soviet school system. In a realistically self-critical school setting, they would constitute an invaluable asset not only from the Communist point of view, but from a more general humanitarian one, also. But having fixed its strong points, Soviet pedagogical practice refuses to take notice of its weak spots. It refuses to make appropriate provision designed not merely to *further equality* but also to *circumvent inequality*. The Soviet school plan claims infallibility. Its positive aspects are open to survey. But only with greatest difficulty does it lend itself to critical examination and study. Consequently, it deprives itself of the opportunity to devise means to decrease its class tensions. And yet it can be predicted that it is precisely these tensions that will give Soviet educators their greatest headache in the years ahead.

Inequalitarian Tensions

There are two iron laws in comparative education. One deals with the problem of whom to teach, the other with what to teach. The first postulates that a combination of mass education with an across-the-board selection for scholastic achievement greatly enhances class feelings in education. The channelling of all careers through schools raises consideration of status in education to the point at which it threatens to overshadow considerations of pure learning.[20] The second law supplies evidence that in all cultures a formalistic, classical curriculum, being in a sense also vocational, creates in pupils expectations for white-collar occupations. The operation of both laws can be traced in all countries. In the Soviet Union, because no careers in any field can be achieved without schooling, and because all students are forced to study according to a formalistic curriculum, the impact of these laws and the resulting social tensions are especially important.

But unfortunately, the means to study them are less ample than elsewhere. Everywhere in the world there is a certain reticence to divulge or acknowledge class feelings. In the Soviet

Union, any suggestion that these exist come into conflict with established doctrine. Thus to a question "Do your pupils prefer to go to a school for medical technicians or to a pedagogical *uchilishche*?" the most likely answer is apt to be: "The pupils would be insulted by such a question. They choose according to their calling." The students, too, adapt to these expectations of their teachers. It is interesting to find, for instance, that in a school for electrical technicians in Minsk, in a class obviously composed of students of diverse backgrounds, no one would raise his hand in answer to the question: "Which of you come from the country?" Then, goaded by their teacher's comment that "the American professor wants to see if we recruit country people into our schools," all those who came from the *derevnya* (and perhaps a few who didn't) indicated their origin. In the absence of opportunities for orderly school surveys, the study of class tensions is in part reduced to a haphazard collection of impressions such as these.

Fortunately, a body of material on the subject exists in the form of testimonials by refugees; one such collection is at Harvard University.[21] The overwhelming majority of these documents refer to the prewar situation. But they afford intimate insights not otherwise obtainable. Furthermore, they can be supported by evidence from the current press that trickles through the *samokritika* columns,[22] by several works of fiction, by the now much-increased opportunities for personal contact and observation, and, last but not least, by Khrushchev's revelations last year about educational snobbery. Together, these sources enable one to reconstruct a tentative picture of class tensions in the Soviet schools.

Accounts of refugees reveal first of all the extent to which education in the Soviet Union is regarded as a tool in making a career. Substantial social rewards, partly outside education, await those who excel in Party politics, in athletics, in the theater, or in record industrial production. Yet the nature of a bureaucratic society recruited on the basis of schooling is such that the ambitions of most people concentrate upon professional careers.

Soviet policy has invested education not only with a cultural, but foremost perhaps, with a vocational character. All really prestige-laden and powerful occupations are now accessible only through formalized training. This has invested education with an unusually potent social meaning for the Soviet people. Out of several hundred refugees interviewed by members of the Harvard Project, only three defined education in purely cultural terms. It is rare, indeed, to hear the following sentiment:

> In my youth I was very curious and I desired to know everything, not for material goods, but because I wanted to be a man who could understand everything that was created.[23]

Other comments, while often stressing the need for education of "all-round, developed persons," are quite different in character. Thus, for instance:

> Before the Revolution, I followed my parents' desire to go into commerce. With the Revolution, I understood that I would never be able to achieve anything without an education. Though late, I continued, therefore, my education. . . . Conditions more or less forced me to get into education. If it had not been for the Soviet regime, I would have probably stayed in the commercial field. This private occupation was, however, no longer possible. I could, of course, have remained a specialized worker, but I wanted to get ahead, to make my life easier by acquiring more education. The Soviet regime helped me in this. I would have had no money [for education] under the Czarist government.[24]

Over and over again, this theme of indispensability of education is repeated. Soviet people emphasize their interest in education by their anxiety "not to be left behind,"[25] "not to lie in the street,"[26] "to be in the *verkhushka* (upper crust),"[27] "to get a piece of bread from it."[28] They feel that education is their only hope of social improvement.

> Education is necessary in life. It is necessary to get a specialty in order to make a decent living. If I had been the son of a

> millionaire, education would have been valuable for me just as education. But for me, for a person in my position, education was my material future.[29]

Even at humble social levels and in grotesque forms, education has become invested with social meanings and values.

> My sister was good-looking, I was not. My father said to me: "You are not good-looking. You probably won't get a man. You had better learn to do something."[30]

Opportunity through schools became not only a necessity but a palliative, a safety valve. "If popular education had been denied, the people would have risen."[31] The Soviet policy has unleashed ambitions which tend to defy the orderly blueprint in the fulfillment of which they were first aroused.

These pressures for education have their impact at all levels. But as the recent reforms amply indicate, the point of admission to universities has become a particularly sensitive danger zone. The Soviet authorities have placed themselves in an impossible set of paradoxical situations. On the one side, they refuse to expand the university places beyond the professional quotas provided by the economic plans; on the other side, their policy of expansion of the upper reaches of secondary schools has presented them with an increased number of general-school graduates aspiring to university training. On the one hand, they encourage the upward educational mobility of the children of workers and peasants; on the other hand, they falter before the pressures for continued educational privileges by the children of the powerful professional classes which they themselves have created. The result is that four well-qualified candidates present themselves demanding admission for each university place available. Obviously the regime cannot continue the folly of disappointing three-quarters of the ablest of the young generation. But the 1958 blueprint of reforms which proposed to make the last two years of secondary education available only on a part-time basis in most instances, and which insists on university admission by

character references rather than by scholastic record, is hardly an adequate method of coping with the situation. The following passage, which describes a similar attempt by Stalin to limit entry by reintroduction of tuition fees (now abandoned), gives an idea of the intensity of the pressures for education which no restrictive reforms can control adequately.

> I was a third-year student when the tuition law of 1940 went through. Only those students who had one subject lower than "excellent" could still expect a scholarship. A typewritten list of students' names was tacked up in place of a wall paper. It was quiet in the hall among the crowd reading the list of names. . . .
>
> Those students who had only one more year to go stuck it through. They lived on a starvation diet, just to be able to finish the university. Students from the first and second year had to leave, because nobody could afford the tuition. These young men were sent to work in some factories as plain laborers: there was never any hope for them to get out of *proizvodstvo* (industry). . . .
>
> One of the students committed suicide. He couldn't see how he could exist any longer. It was not so much the question of getting an education as it was the question of life and death. Students as a group are a bit apart from others, with some privileges and some advantages. Those who were forced out of that group had nothing to look forward to.[32]

So far, all past attempts to regulate this intense desire of the Soviet people for education have been directed not toward relieving, but toward multiplying the bottlenecks in education. The feverish competition that inevitably results has generated a veritable array of social tensions.

Such tensions obviously stem from friction between the now-established intelligentsia and the masses. In the first decades of Soviet rule, the members of the old intelligentsia were barred from educational opportunity. The new intelligentsia that was in the making in the schools came from, felt, looked, and acted like the masses from which it had sprung. The pressing need for

professional manpower made meteoric careers an everyday occurrence and imbued the school enterprise with an atmosphere of optimism. There was elbowroom for everybody. In the Stalin era, this situation began to change. The present gulf between the intelligentsia and the masses, though still not precipitous, is widening. The children of the two classes bring into the schools increasingly different patterns of beliefs and behavior. Rapid mobility is less likely; the existing restrictions of opportunity as a rule allow for only slow upward movement. Also, the surviving old intelligentsia is bolder in asserting its prerevolutionary mores. The social picture of Soviet education is acquiring a new coloring, and with the change, cracks in the walls of uniformity and unity have begun to appear.

First of all, noticeable attempts are being made to separate the well-to-do from the mass of children. The basic Soviet common-school ambitions are, as elsewhere, continuously threatened by attempts to establish elitist institutions. In several instances when one encounters special or unusual educational provisions in the Soviet Union, it is safe to assume that one will run into evidence of germinating class divisions.

The conversion of special-purpose institutions into socially divisive schools is one of the oldest tricks of rising elites. The effort to create separate schools for the intellectually gifted and the public opposition to it, alluded to previously, were only one instance of a familiar process that has obvious social connotations. Several types of special schools already in existence supply other documentation of this persistent tendency. The Suvorov and Nakhimov Military Schools now openly accord priority to children of military personnel. The special art and music schools do not canvass the total age group for the best-available talent, but merely select the most suitable candidates from among those *who apply*. No doubt such applications include those whom teachers in ordinary schools discover and encourage. Yet in the world-famous Leningrad Ballet School, 60 per cent of the pupils each year are acknowledged to be from families residing in the city itself.[33] Five pupils polled at random in the music school in

Minsk were all children of orchestra conductors or university professors. Housed in commodious, historic buildings, enjoying famous reputations, offering better comforts (silk aprons instead of cotton ones), such schools are the inevitable targets of parents who appreciate the advantages of differential education. Even if their children have only slightly more than average talent, in the words of the R.S.F.S.R. Minister of Education, "Papa and mama act as if sonny were Paganini." Also, the early post-revolutionary policy of barring people with "wrong" unproletarian backgrounds from special schools has lent several schools an aura of exclusivity that, in the course of time, has tended to assume a social character. Thus military, political, and aviation schools "were considered honorable. . . . To go to an aviation school one had to have a desirable social background."[34] Foreign-language schools have undergone a similar development.

> The German school in Odessa was considered the best. The best teachers of the old days were retained, fewer changes in teaching methods occurred. Those families which wanted to make certain of a superior education for their children sent their children to the German school, where the language of instruction was German, and Russian was taught as one of the foreign languages. The school was closed in 1938.[35]

The German school in Moscow attended by Wolfgang Leonhard does not appear to have had much social character.[36] But new foreign-language schools are now being created as part of the experimental program of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. In them, as David Burg's essay (*see* p. 200) indicates, the elite has found a new clandestine haven for its children.[37]

The famous Russian nationality policy also seems to be a two-edged sword. The Soviet schools in nationality republics meticulously provide an opportunity for non-Russian nationals to pursue school and, now, even university studies in their own languages. In such schools, the effectiveness of the study of Russian is often no greater than the study of any other foreign language. Thus, several young people at Kazakh University in

Alma Ata and in a rural school outside Tashkent in Uzbekistan (even in a Russian-language class in front of a Russian teacher) were unable to answer simple questions in Russian. This results in a serious professional handicap, since no person without a thorough knowledge of Russian can hope to advance in all-Union careers or even in any post outside his own republic. The attraction of the Russian schools which exist side by side with the national schools in all cities is thus obvious. As a result, there exists an unacknowledged though visible class line between the two types of schools. In the Russian ten-year school in Alma Ata all the Kazakh children interrogated (some twenty-five) were children of professionals and spoke Russian at home (although they study Kazakh at school as a second language). By contrast, in the Kazakh school in Alma Ata, as well as in the Tatar school in Kazan, the majority of the children seemed to have come from working-class and peasant homes. Nationality policy has thus, unintentionally, come to mean the Russification of the socially mobile, while the cultivation of ethnic nationality feelings tends to emerge as a barrier to opportunity.

The accident of settlement also has social meaning, as it does in other educational systems. One does not have to elaborate at length on the obvious difference between city and country schools. As one witness put it:

> The only advantage was that we lived in town where I had greater possibility to attend school. Village schools were on a lower level. Children who came from villages and wanted to continue their schooling had to repeat their last grade.[38]

Residence in large cities, and especially in Moscow, represents yet another special professional advantage. To one student "being in Moscow meant for us all greater opportunities for advancement."[39] A student from Novosibirsk felt that "in Moscow, schools and educational conditions were better than in the provinces, and I resented this."[40] Within cities themselves, patterns of settlement, somewhat like in the United States, have rendered the schools in better areas almost wholly professional

in character. According to David Burg, one can go to school in Moscow for ten years and seldom come into contact with a working-class child.[41] Similarly:

> In Kharkov there was one school in the center of the city for better children, not because they were selected, but because this was where they lived. There was another district; it was a bit out of the city and there the workers and the simpler people lived. And I knew that there were children in that school who went around with knives; they were plain bandits, just hooligans, and sometimes they were *bezprizornye* children. One could not go out in the street at night. You would either be killed or there would be somebody drunken. At home I never feared to go out alone at night, but there it was impossible.[42]

In spite of extra payment for professional services in rural areas, complaints about the flight of youth from country to city now appear regularly in the press.[43] As for those who have graduated from urban schools, Khrushchev said: "You can't smoke them out of the city, no matter what kind of gas you use."[44] But perhaps the best story of the difference between an urban and a rural career is supplied by a foreman in a rural dairy who has had only six years of schooling:

> I had a cousin on my father's side. We were of the same age and went to school together. But he continued. That is the reason that I tried so much: his father sent him to school and so I wanted to go as well. And now look how completely different our fates were. He went to school, I could not. Our material conditions, that is, of our fathers, were exactly the same. By character he was different from me. He was taller, he fought much, he was daring and courageous. He finished the ten-year school in 1926. After that he gets into the tractor plant at Stalingrad and worked for a year as a locksmith. This was in 1928. There, at the Stalingrad plant, he joined the Party. I don't know whether he had been in the Komsomol. Then, in 1929, he became a shop chief, and works in this profession for a year. Then, in 1930, he goes to Moscow to the Institute of Heavy Industry and finishes it in 1933. For

> a while I do not know what he did. I lost contact with him. I saw him only in 1938 in Moscow when I went to the city. I went to his apartment. He is married but he has no children. Before that he had another wife and children and he had divorced his first wife. In 1938 he is the chief of the project bureau of the Frazier plant. This is a big plant. He is still a Party member by that time. For himself and his wife he had an apartment of four rooms and a kitchen and a bath. They were well-furnished, every room has a complete set of furniture, electric light, steam, etc. He also has a maid. He lives like a *barin*. But his wife also worked. They had good clothing, he even had a hat; I was surprised at that. It was not fashionable to wear hats. This was not political. However, he has no automobile. Here you have two different roads. He broke through to the city where I had wanted to go.[45]

Recent Soviet statistics, which established that 95 per cent of the schools cater to less than eighty pupils each,[46] confirmed a long-standing suspicion that the much-praised large-city schools are substantially superior in character.

> The teachers were much better in large centers. I could see the difference between the school in Pushkino, a suburb of Leningrad, and those of Voronesh. In the latter, most teachers were young and inexperienced. Some of these would not lecture but would read their notes in a monotonous voice.[47]

Whether through deliberate social manipulation or accident of recruitment, better Soviet schools can potentially foster divisiveness. Since no effort is made to assess and hold in check such social consequences, the danger of disruption of the equalitarian framework is particularly great and serious. But the threat of separation is not the only source of friction. In addition to outside elitist pressures upon the organization, the presence of the children of the new class has generated several areas of tension inside the mass schools.

Class animosities are asserting themselves first of all through attention paid to speech. Forty years after the Revolution it is still the way words are pronounced—*deushki* (goils), instead of

devushki (girls)—that singles out the people who are *pervoe pokolenie* (first generation). Evidence of tensions of this type in Soviet education is abundant. One can do no better than to present two poignant passages in which tensions between students and teachers reveal themselves to be due to discrimination based on speech patterns:

> Our director of the pedagogical institute, he was just a worker, an unlettered man. He could read and write, yes, but he wasn't very educated. We students laughed at him, because we were educated and the director was not. When we were at meetings, it was funny to listen to him. He didn't speak very correctly and certainly not very nicely . . . he was rather a coarse fellow, just a worker, a simple fellow with just a worker's background. He joined the Party without really knowing what it was all about and began to move up further and further. . . . He would have been better as a worker in a factory. He knew the students laughed at him and it made him feel very uncomfortable.[48]

> There was a teacher of mathematics who spoke Russian very badly, coming from a peasant family. She had great difficulties with the students for they had no respect for her and often mimicked her strange accent and ungrammatical expressions. Often a student would repeat a sentence as she had spoken it, incorrectly, and she would, recognizing her error, make the student correct himself. She had great difficulties with the students and the director often had to be present in her classroom, or there would have been complete disorder. Often such teachers were transferred as a result of trouble caused by students.[49]

These descriptions speak for themselves. Furthermore, they illustrate a general situation and not only the problems of teachers and pupils. As two further passages indicate, these language tensions seem to operate also between parents and children, and among children themselves:

> I felt sorry for my parents when they came to visit me. Here was my loved father and mother—the closest people in the

> world—they had to speak Russian in the city and their Russian was not correct. All their lives they spoke and taught in the Ukrainian language. This was humiliating to them. Somehow they acted as if they were ashamed of themselves because their Russian was incorrect.[50]

> My people were the old intelligentsia, and papa was of that group too. I even did not believe that he had been a shoemaker. Mother had taught him a great deal, and also the conservatory. This intelligentsia was different from the new one. The new one was composed of people from the village who—hm—studied in the city, maybe even the University or the Institute, but still you could tell by their conversation or even by their appearance that they were our new intelligentsia. Their names were different from the old intelligentsia. In the Soviet Union there are many of them, but there are still many of the old intelligentsia. Many differences exist . . .
>
> I was very happy about it, even proud. My mother told me not to play with some children, who were the children of simple workers and who were always dirty and talked in a bad language.[51]

As these examples indicate, speech patterns play a formidable role in class defenses. In view of the magnitude of the reshuffling which Soviet society has undergone, such persistence is remarkable and instructive.

Clothes only somewhat less than speech seem to evoke a gamut of class feelings. "To have money and dress well and to be cultivated and cultured"[52] has become one of the accepted norms for the children of the new class. These habits stand out in a culture poor in clothes and yet self-conscious about lack of style and fashion. The appearance of the *stilyagi* has provoked new dissatisfactions and protests, both public and private. Thus in one school, pupils poured water on the feet of a girl sporting red boots, until she was forced to cease wearing them.[53] In another school, a pupil was laughed at because of ribbons in her hair and pretty clothes. "*Intelligentka, meshchanka,* look at her! She wears a lace collar, ha!"[54] Such are often the responses of classmates to displays of elegance in school. There is no doubt

that class jealousy occupies a formidable place among Soviet youth.

> She frequently had new dresses. If we asked her: "Where did you get that new dress?" she answered: "Oh, mother made it out of something old we had."
>
> It was no mother who made something new out of something old. There was nothing old about anything she had, we could see it plainly . . .
>
> Our clothing situation was so acute that we had to borrow a good dress from one another if one of us was invited somewhere for an outing. We girls shared willingly what we had. If one was fortunate to get a new dress, one always shared one's good luck with them.
>
> But she would have insulted us if she tried to share something. Nobody would have taken anything from her . . . I could never have been able to repay her so I never would have taken anything from her. . . .[55]

The battle of clothes has never been and is not confined to students. It is also of obvious interest to the authorities. Thus the teachers, when confronted by their pupils' distinctive clothing, vacillate between accusations of *klassovoe chuvstvo* (class feeling) and the attitudes ordinarily meted out to delinquents. The following passage is a good recent illustration:

> The crux of the matter is, [so states a letter from Alma Ata Institute of Foreign Languages], that a few officials at the Institute blithely judged a student primarily and literally because of the way she dressed. The Institute director personally looked at the hairdo's of the students in the English department and concluded that Melnikova, Kartukha, Shugailo, and Ivanova were *stilyagi.* Of course these girls have different natures, interests, and views of life, but decisive importance was assigned to their hairdo's. In the opinion of the Institute officials, Shugailo's hair was too short, Kartukha's bangs were too long, and for some reason Ivanova did not have the right kind of braids. In short, they were *stilyagi.*
>
> "That girl has a tendency to *stilyagi* ways" was the first thing the dean of the English department said about Ivanova.

"In what way?"

"You can see from their hairdo's what kind of people Melnikova, Kartukha, Shugailo, and Ivanova are. Of course, I don't deny that Ivanova is an honest, capable person, but her hairdo and skirt show a clear tendency . . ."

We asked Levenshtern, the secretary of the Komsomol committee at the Institute, why three students were expelled from the Komsomol and banned from the dormitory for twenty-four hours and why the fourth was reprimanded and had an entry made on her card.

"It's because of those narrow skirts," answered Levenshtern.[56]

Finally, general manners, no less than speech and clothes, form the basis of social classification, even in Communist education. The following statement by a Soviet worker indicates how deep is the awareness of this in all social classes:

> What does it mean he is more cultured? He has more education, he has finished school, he is literate. And if I had only four years of school, where can I get culture? I would like to have it, but I cannot address myself to these people. Workers and peasants are simple, they just say, "Sit down, Vanka, let's drink." The intelligentsia is more or less delicate. For this reason there is a different way of life. One is more simple and one is more intelligent, that's why they are called intelligentsia.[57]

Marriages, friendships, and informal relations are, as everywhere else in the world, based, sometimes unconsciously and sometimes by design, on the strength of a common social and educational platform. "If he is from the village, I have nothing to say to him. Of course, I respect him as a human being and I respect his soul, but I have no common topics of conversation with him."[58] At the time of the purges, this concern with manners could even lead to interesting cleavages of conscience.

> Everyone knows fear and no one knows how to behave. For example, an intellectual doesn't know whether or not to help a woman on with a coat because if he does he may be called

"bourgeois" and if he doesn't he feels that he is lacking in manners.[59]

The emphasis on "keeping up with friends culturally" and "speaking their language" is a remarkable example of persisting class feelings. Several novels, for instance *Students* by Yuri Trifonov (now available in English), abound in examples of pure concern with etiquette. To keep the bottom button of one's jacket unbuttoned, to dub perfume correctly behind the ears, to examine women's dresses through opera glasses at the theater —these are new badges of behavior and status that distinguish the "students" from the "workers." Even the deliberately decorous way with which the former make a point of treating the latter now carries a suspicious tinge of patronizing middle-class condescension.

It is the insistence on proper speech, clothing, and manners in Soviet society and education as well as the attempts at separation that mark off the "refined" from the "unrefined." The general social mood makes it obvious that the models thus established are not losing any of their dynamic vitality at present. If nothing else, Khrushchev's recent admissions make it clear that the refugee descriptions pertaining to prewar days have preserved and perhaps increased their validity. The social weapons habitually sought in education by the rising new classes are the same in the U.S.S.R. as in all other mass societies. Enforced industrialization is bringing in its wake not only a vision of enlightened and fraternal humanity; it threatens to exact the price of turning the schools into seedbeds of a new and hardly equalitarian "meritocracy."

The reaction of those who are left behind in the race for new elite positions also remains to be mentioned briefly. The movement of new social groups away from the equalitarian basis of education has, by and large, left the masses stunned, half believing, refusing to bring to the surface the lurking disquietude that the sacrifice of the Revolution was in vain. But hoping against hope cannot comfort forever a people deprived of demo-

cratic checks and balances. Thus three major types of informal reactions to the growing inequities have made their appearance to complicate further the difficult enterprise of educational planning.

The first consists of jumping on the band wagon and racing for education.

> My father never said a word if I came home with a broken nose or a black eye, but if I brought home bad marks from school he really gave me a walloping.[60]

The drive for careers in education as an escape from inequality has generated what amounts to a hatred of tasks assigned to the *chernorabochie* (black laborers) and the *muzhiks* (peasants—now an offensive term). "In the Soviet Union people without education are not considered people. They are just like horsepower."[61] The fear of being considered inferior amounts almost to an obsession with some Soviet groups. There are discernible elements of insecurity among the working and peasant classes and consequently among their children. The following excerpt from a story published in *Komsomolskaya pravda* in 1950, supplies its own eloquent illustration:

> Two months passed and I had become very used to having him around; to be quite honest, his friendship meant a lot to me. I thought that Shchepkin was probably an architecture student who was spending his holidays down here. . . . And then our friendship went to pieces. . . . Tolya stopped opposite the House of Culture, pointed to an ornamented plaster work cornice and asked me whether I liked it. . . . "It's nothing special, just an ordinary cornice." And then I thought I'd better say something to cover up my absentmindedness, and so I added: "It's nice, very nice." Tolya looked pleased and squeezed my hand. I'd never seen him like this before. "You know, Galina," he said, "When I made that cornice I was only in grade four." . . . So I asked him: "Do you mean to say you're just an ordinary plasterer?" I suddenly imagined what he'd look like in overalls all splashed with plaster. I had another good look at Tolya, and he seemed

> quite different now. He was wearing a new, navy-blue suit, but I kept seeing him in overalls full of white splashes. "And I thought you were an architecture student." I blurted out. "And what's wrong with being a plasterer?" he said. I told him that that wasn't what I'd meant, but I just didn't seem to be able to make up for what I'd said. We went on in silence; neither of us could think of anything to say. Right at the entrance to the stadium he suddenly turned around and quickly walked off without saying goodbye or anything.[62]

The second mass defense consists of open complaints against the *nachalniki* (leaders) for fostering injustices in education. Beginning with the man who claimed that one has to be literate even for physical labor to be able to check upon the accountant so that he cannot cheat one by crediting one with only half one's labor record,[63] to the songstress in the Ural choir who complained on the Sverdlovsk stage that her lover had changed into an icicle since he joined the Komsomol, there are rumblings of thinly veiled discontent, lately also revealed in cautious, published statements opposing the new reform plan. Complaints about lack of money[64] and educational opportunity alternate with observations about the privileges of the "big shots" and with stories about the advancement of Party members with phony educational records. There are tales of Komsomol usurpation of school privileges, as well as more general anti-intellectual animosities:

> The only differences in the Soviet Union are those between the intellectuals and the workers. The intellectuals look upon the workers as the *temny narod* (dark people) and consider them very inferior. I hate intellectuals.[65]

One sure way to fluster Soviet bystanders who always surround foreign visitors so eagerly is to point out that with the memory of the Revolution receding, the danger of selfish elitism replacing what they still believe to be their dedicated leadership is by no means remote. No other phrase has the power to produce such sudden silence and thoughtfulness in the audience.

The third escape from class tensions is to revert to the pre-revolutionary proletarian pattern and to refuse to attach importance to education and all forms of upward striving. The millions of peasants who, until the past decade, were not allowed to leave their kolkhozes, whose children do not seek or qualify for selection beyond the usual fourth or seventh year of education, the millions of workers who leave school in early adolescence and enter the factories directly—in short, the masses of Soviet people for whom full education is not an attainable goal—cannot be expected indefinitely to display a positive attitude towards it. The fact that education, however desirable, is beyond their reach may create a pattern of rejection and sullen withdrawal which has been the mark of "lower class" sub-culture everywhere, but particularly among the Russians. Sentiments such as "if one is a big professor, then it is harder on one,"[66] or, "dirty work is happier work"[67] abound in refugee sources. In this we find a curious convergence between the peasant claiming that "the school won't give you anything; to eat, go into the field and work"[68] and the comments of a member of the old intelligentsia who testified:

> People would study and lose time and afterwards not be able to earn anything, to have an apartment; perhaps they would have only one unit, and if they had a family they just could not feed them. I used to be astonished about why they permitted people to study so much. . . . I learned nothing from them and remained unspoiled.[69]

The feelings of anti-intellectualism and passivity, the charges that education does not fulfill its role and that, therefore, it is not worth fighting for, represent perhaps the greatest threat to Soviet society. For they strike a blow at the heart of the bold design in the name of which the people in Russian lands, and through them indirectly people all over the world, have been so painfully uprooted. In this lies the greatest danger for Soviet education. Contrary to the claims now made in the United States it is the tolerance of inequality, and not equality, that represents the largest single obstacle to activism. Should apathy spread with

the loss of equality, the now much-admired Soviet energy and dedication would, no doubt, dwindle correspondingly.

"With the Soviets, all classes were supposed to be annihilated. But they returned nevertheless. You cannot annihilate them."[70] They pose, even if their reach and extent cannot now be measured, a challenge to Soviet educational legislators. Given the system, it is hard to know how they might escape it. In essence, Soviet educational problems are everybody's problems. The monopolistic prestige of academic careers, bolstered by a fixed college-oriented secondary-school curriculum, creates class tensions in all countries in which it is found. Unless Communist authorities are willing to match their technological progress and social upgrading of some occupations by a fully elective secondary-school curriculum and unlimited expansion of university places, they will fail to achieve the over-all professionalization which seems to be an inescapable solution in all systems dedicated to mass education. Soviet educators claim that their country cannot now afford to train "carpenters with higher education." But if the equalitarian design of the Revolution is to be preserved, one wonders if they now can afford not to train them.

5. Antireligious Education of Soviet Youth[1]

by ALESSIO U. FLORIDI

It is a well-known fact that the Communists wage war against all religion. The reasons for this are also well known. For Marx, religion was an aspect of the economic oppression of the masses. It is the "opium of the people" which lulls the working class. By analogy, religion for Lenin was a "kind of spiritual moonshine, by which the slaves of capitalism lose their human personality, their aspirations for something more dignified as human beings."[2]

The Communist war on religion is of a practical-political rather than of a theoretical character. From this stem the changing intensity and the changing methods of this war. These methods have been at times violent and vulgar, at times more "persuasive" and "scientific." The story varies from the Revolution to World War II, to the death of Stalin, to Khrushchev's advent of power.

During the "patriotic war," Stalin was obliged to let up on his antireligious campaign. But soon after the death of the dictator (March 5, 1953), the Party began to fear the progress made by religion, especially among the youth. In May of that year, Shelepin, First Secretary of the Komsomol, denounced the gravity of the situation.[3] The following August, a Komsomol periodical insistently reminded its readers that the "war against religious prejudice is an integral part of the fight for the Communist education of the working class, for the education of active

and conscientious builders of Communism [who must be] free of any and all links to the past."[4]

The antireligious involvement of the school system was demonstrated in an article published in an educational publication devoted to the methods of teaching history in secondary schools. The youngsters must be taught that: (a) religion always depends on material circumstances and does not respond to a deep and lasting need in man; (b) religion and the church, especially the Roman Catholic Church, are always reactionary, and that religious morality and Communist morality are always fundamentally antagonistic to one another; (c) religion and science are irreconcilable; and finally, (d) the students must know the Party policies toward religion. Objective descriptions of and comparative differences between creeds must be avoided in teaching, since this could produce the contrary effect; that is, it could propagate religion. To find out which pupils come from religious families, the teacher will ask: "Who will tell me something about the origins of religion?" The teacher will then require the pupils to transcribe the most important quotations of antireligious authors, such as Engels, for example: "Every religion is nothing but a reflection in the fancy of men of the external forces that dominate them in daily life."[5]

The November 10, 1954, decree of the Central Committee on the "mistakes of the Party's scientific-atheistic propaganda among the population," signed by Khrushchev, gave new impetus to the atheistic campaign among Soviet youth. As a result, the Minister of Education of the R.S.F.S.R. restated the fact that the schools, the family, and the Komsomol must unite their efforts to free youth of prejudices and religious superstitions.[6] The trade unions also were called upon to contribute.[7] F. Oleshchuk commented in great detail upon Khrushchev's decree in *Voprosy filosofii*, concluding that "it would be erroneous to think that the overthrow of religion can depend only on a restricted number of persons—the specialized atheists. The fight against religion is the duty of the entire Soviet intelligentsia, the best propaganda agents of the Party and the Komsomol."[8] At

the same time, *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, the official publication of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the R.S.F.S.R., contained three articles with these significant titles: "The Scientific-Atheistic Education of Pupils as an Essential Part of Communist Education";[9] "Atheistic Education in the Schools";[10] and "N. K. Krupskaya on the Atheistic Education of Children."[11] The Party directives are thus obvious: Soviet schools, as instruments of Communist education, cannot be neutral with respect to religion, but must actively and positively fight religion; they cannot be only nonreligious, they must be antireligious. Experience proves —*Sovetskaya pedagogika* noted—that the so-called "nonreligious" education, which means that the teacher merely presents scientific doctrines without direct attacks on religion, has always brought uncomfortable results for atheism. In the schools where such a "nonreligious" philosophy of education was put into practice in recent years it was shown that "manifestations of various religious superstitions were observed even in the upper grades." Soviet schools must, therefore, have a "clear antireligious purpose." They must make the students derive from scientific facts those deductions that the "majority does not." They must inculcate in youth antireligious attitudes so that youth may understand the necessity of fighting religion, for participating actively in this fight, and thus ensuring that the young people become "conscientious and convinced atheists, ready to fight effectively against the various religious superstitions and points of view."

While the Communists seek to give a scientific basis to their antireligious war and accuse the faithful of dogmatism and bad faith, it is with unusual ease that they, themselves, affirm the most questionable dogmas without proof. Such dogmas include those that affirm the incompatibility of science and religion and the reactionary character of all religion. Teachers during their lectures must not omit any occasion to prove and restate this incompatibility. For example, the physics teacher, after having explained the Newtonian laws of universal gravitation, must add that before the discovery of this law men attributed to God, a

"supernatural force," the orderly movement of the celestial bodies, and he must point out that science has proved that this fact does "not correspond to reality." "Present-day physics is productive, it produces dialectical materialism"—from this phrase of Lenin one can learn that all progress in the field of physics and chemistry in the U.S.S.R. is due to materialist induction.[12]

A recent manual on atheistic education in the schools[13] explains in great detail, in eleven chapters, how instructors must introduce antireligious principles into their teaching. One of the positions of religion, notes the chapter of the manual devoted to the teaching of human anatomy and physiology, is that there is in man a "divine particle"—the soul—which, after death, returns to the supernatural world. When man is asleep, the soul leaves the body temporarily and returns when he awakens. During sleep, God may appear to man and predict the future. By explaining the constitution and function of every living organism (digestion, circulation of the blood, respiration, and secretion), using comparative anatomical tables, etc., the teacher, in contradiction of this belief, can lay the basis for the fundamental concept that man belongs to nature and that there is nothing "divine," mysterious, or supernatural in him.

Another publication of the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences contains a special chapter on the atheistic education of pupils which describes the teaching methods of certain teachers. Thus one teacher, Sundukov, is praised and acclaimed for his method of teaching geography. Sundukov, speaking about "the population of the U.S.A.," noted that the country is hostile to true progress since the teaching of Darwinism is forbidden and propaganda for superstition and mysticism is very pronounced. Moreover, "in the U.S.A., as per incomplete official data, more than 7,500,000 poor children cannot attend school."[14]

The Western reader is astonished by such statements in official publications which pretend to have the sanction of scientific truth. But when one remembers that Soviet leaders keep repeating that Communism is the repository of the summit of human thought,[15] that new scientific data can never serve to force the

revision of the argument about the existence of materialism "since Lenin has proved the eternal validity of materialism,"[16] and that "true science is materialistic by nature,"[17] then one will no longer be astonished. One will not wonder at the obligation of teachers to propagate atheism through their lectures on mathematics,[18] nor at the fact that a man as doubtlessly intelligent as Ilya Ehrenburg wrote in exaltation of the artificial sputniks that "Marxism has counterposed scientific thought to religious dogma and the teaching of the Catechism; reason, to ignorance," at the same time calling Copernicus and Galileo atheists and materialists.[19]

Regarding this falsification one might refer to another theory of Lenin—the theory of so-called "allegiance." "The well-known German scientist Arthur Drews in his book called *The Myth of Christ* mistakes fables for religious prejudices," wrote the founder of Bolshevism. "He shows that Christ never existed, but at the end of the book reinstates religion, a new religion, renewed, cleansed, refined, capable of resisting the current of naturalism, which grows from day to day. He is a declared, conscious reactionary who openly helps the oppressors to substitute new prejudices, even more repugnant and infamous, for the old ones. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Drews' works are not to be translated. . . . To avoid a connection with the representatives of the eighteenth-century bourgeoisie, that is, of an age in which the bourgeoisie was the revolutionary class, would mean a betrayal of Marxism and materialism, because alliance with the Drewses in a certain sense and under various limitations is indispensable for us who fight against religious obscurantism."[20]

For Lenin, therefore, it makes little difference whether "victims" of religion and its "adversaries" are really atheists, materialists, or Communists. What matters is that their behavior, their speeches, and their writings, which if taken as a whole would have a completely different meaning, help the cause at a given time. Under these circumstances, it does not even matter whether the facts are untrue, or whether the writings are misconstrued or without scientific value. "Engels," Lenin wrote, "advised the

leaders of the modern proletariat for some time to translate and disseminate the atheistic publications of the late eighteenth century. We have not yet done this . . . we try at times to justify our weakness, our tardiness, and our inability with all sorts of higher considerations, saying, for instance, that the old atheistic literature of the eighteenth century is obsolete, that it is unscientific and infantile. . . . There is nothing worse than this pseudo-scientific sophistry. . . . Of course one can find in the atheistic works of the eighteenth-century revolutionists many things which are unscientific and even infantile, but nothing prevents the editors of these works from abridging them and adding short commentaries. . . . It would be the gravest error . . . to believe that the popular masses . . . could come out of this darkness by following the directness of a purely Marxist education. It is indispensable to furnish these masses with the most varied material of atheistic propaganda."[21]

With these principles in mind, one can understand how men who were never atheists and who never dreamed of advocating the joys of a Soviet paradise can be called advocates of atheistic Communism. In Russia alone, Radishev, Pushkin, Lermontov, Nekrasov, Saltykov-Shchedrin, Mendeleyev, and Tolstoy are classed among the precursors of present-day militant atheism. At the celebrations of the second centennial of Moscow University, named after Lomonosov, Soviet newspapers wrote that this great scientist was "the father of materialistic-philosophic thought in Russia."[22] It is a well-known fact, however, that Lomonosov was not at all an atheist. He wrote the *Spiritual Odes*, a free translation of psalms and other passages of the Old Testament, which, together with his *Reflections on the Greatness of God*, were adapted by the Russian Old Believers in their liturgy.[23]

The "Soviet Natural Sciences against Religion" division of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism in Leningrad contains a large image of the great Russian physiologist I. P. Pavlov.[24] But everyone in Leningrad knows that Pavlov was a deeply religious man. There even is an anecdote about a young Komsomol who saw Pavlov come out of a church and, not

recognizing him, exclaimed with contempt: "Ah! religious obscurantism!"[25]

While it is true that the so-called Russian democratic writers of the nineteenth century, such as Belinsky, Herzen, Chernishevsky, Dobrolyubov, etc., were atheists, they did not, of course, subscribe to a Soviet-type dictatorship. This explains why their works published in the Soviet Union have been "abridged" in the spirit of Lenin.[26]

In the already-quoted decree of the Central Committee on the errors in scientific–atheistic propaganda, Khrushchev acknowledges the fact that this propaganda is often based "on anecdotes and fables." In looking over the vast Soviet atheistic literature,[27] one must agree that it cannot be otherwise. The Communists ignore the fact that apart from the value and content of the various positive religions, the fundamental problem of every man's conscience is the problem of God, a problem which directly touches upon human reason.

But Lenin is afraid to let men reason. "We must not, in any event," he wrote, "err by putting the religious question on an abstract and idealistic basis, in rational terms, removed from the class war, as the democratic radical bourgeoisie so often does."[28] From this stems the preference of the Communists for the fables and the marginal aspects of religion. Not having been able to find one single valid argument to prove that God does not exist, they have deliberately confused religion with "religious prejudices" and "superstition," ridiculing religious feasts and rites, miracles and prophecies.

In the end, it is the Communists themselves, however, who are refuted. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, for instance, first repudiates religious prophecies but then adds: "When the occasion presents itself, it is necessary to show to the students the cases of certain wonderful scientific auguries when men . . . basing their argument on social laws, prophesied the advent of social events of the greatest importance. . . . Among the clearest examples of these scientific visions is the prophecy of Marx and Engels, in 1881, regarding the approach of the socialist revolution in Russia;

that of Engels, in 1887, on the character of World War I; those of Lenin, in 1915, on the possibility of the victory of socialism in only one country and, in 1920, on the advisability of Russia being covered by a thick net of electric stations and supplied by a powerful technical organization, so that our socialist economy would become the example for a socialist Europe and Asia in the future; that of I. V. Stalin, in 1927, on the character of the revolutionary power in China, etc."[29] Everyone knows, however, that the Communist revolution has succeeded in backward countries, such as Russia and China, rather than in the advanced nations in Western Europe where Marx and Engels in fact expected it to happen. Regarding Stalin's prophecies, among which was counted also the prophecy of the "inevitable defeat of Hitler's army,"[30] it will be enough to reread the secret speech of Khrushchev to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party to realize how ridiculous as well as tragic these predictions have been. In today's Russia, classes and property have not disappeared, as the authors of the October Revolution had prophesied and foretold, while the family and the schools have undergone an evolution exactly contrary to the Communist "laws of social life." The conditions of the change to a Communist society are so utopian in character that no serious man can accept them as "scientific predictions."[31]

But what is relevant here is that the predictions of Leninism regarding religion are particularly erroneous. The fact that today in the Soviet Union, after forty years of persecution and atheistic propaganda, there are still believers, even among the young, means that Marx was wrong when he wrote that religion "lives of this earth and not of heaven and with the destruction of the perverse reality of which religion is the theory it will perish of itself."[32] The "perverse reality," the abuse of man by man, according to the repeated statements of Soviet leaders, has been dead for a long time in the U.S.S.R., but faith is still very far from "perishing by self-extinction," and the authorities have thus been forced once again to condemn as heresy the theory of the "spontaneous disappearance of religion."[33]

To hasten the death of religion, Soviet pedagogy, in addition to classwork, takes advantage of an entire network of extracurricular activities in which all organizations participate. To foster the diffusion of atheism, all mass media which are necessary to rid men of any remnant of religious prejudice are being utilized—the press, the theater, broadcasting, the movies, etc. This is why, under the guidance of the Communist Party, all the official associations, the Komsomol, and the other public and state associations, are employed in the dissemination of scientific-atheistic propaganda.[34]

The movie industry deserves particular attention here. A recent Soviet publication on the "use of the movies in scientific-atheistic propaganda" lists, among others, the following titles of pictures which, it would seem, have nothing to do with anti-religious propaganda: "The Law of the Great Love"; "In the Depths of the Sea"; "In the Name of Man"; "Sleep and Hypnosis in the Light of Pavlov's Teachings"; "Before the World"; "How We See"; "How We Hear"; "The Solar and Lunar Eclipses"; "The Great Universe"; "The Force of Life"; "Thunder and Lightning"; "Flying Stars"; "Health and Nutrition"; "In the Name of Life."[35] But this source also states that to attack faith it is enough to substitute science for religion so that all phenomena became scientifically explicable: "Even lectures and conversations on medicine are of the greatest importance in antireligious propaganda. . . . Religion affirms that illness is willed by a divine power to punish man for his sins. Science refutes these myths."[36]

To underline and facilitate the atheistic interpretation of "scientific" films, the above-mentioned volume suggests various methods:

a. Lesson with separate commentary. Before the projection of the film an expert explains the antireligious meaning of the theme. At the end of the picture, the same expert answers the questions of the viewers and leads the discussion.

b. Lesson with commentary during the projection. In addition to the introduction, which may not last more than twenty

to thirty minutes, the propagandist from time to time stops the projection of the film and comments. The more significant parts are repeated. A discussion and the conclusions follow.

c. Atheistic lesson illustrated by film selections. During the projection of the film, it may be feasible to stop the sound track and substitute a more appropriate comment. Thus, the commentator plays a major role and the film is reduced to the exposition of the antireligious theme.

d. Cycles of lessons, following the methods explained above or alternating with them, as is convenient where four or five conferences are held on the same topic.

e. Cineforum. Here the speaker, unlike the commentator in the previously described method, limits himself to the final discussion.

f. Festival of the scientific-atheistic cinema, which takes about a month and a half. Even during the festival, no truly antireligious conferences are held. The work of the propagandist is limited to a brief explicatory introduction (ten to fifteen minutes before each film), with another such commentary at the end.

The Communist youth associations and Komsomol officials, in addition to movies, have at their disposal a number of antireligious documentary films more polemic in character. Some of their titles are: "Of the History of the War of Science Against Religion"; "Great Russian Scientists Against Religion"; "Scientific-Atheistic Propaganda"; "Religion Among the Ancient Greeks"; "The Origin of Christianity"; "The History of the Papacy and the Inquisition"; "Science and Religion."[37]

To intensify the antireligious campaign, a network of "seminars" was set up in the Soviet Union for the purpose of training educators and propagandists as qualified atheists. A seminar with continuing courses has been established in Leningrad near the former Church of the Madonna of Kazan, now the Antireligious Museum.[38] Other seminars of short duration have been instituted in the various republics of the U.S.S.R.[39] In the Kazakh Republic, "almost 10,000 antireligious activists" were

graduated, and some fifty antireligious "truly scientific" propaganda booklets were published.[40]

In 1957, the Society for the Propagation of Political and Scientific Studies sponsored a conference on scientific-atheistic propaganda. The President of the Society, Academician M. B. Mitin, had to confess with regret that there was a resurgence of religious activities.[41] Notwithstanding the initiative of the Party, of the press,[42] and of the schools[43] to combat religion, a part of Soviet youth is not easily deceived. Sometimes the youngsters ask questions which even the propagandists are not able to answer. Why did Moussorgsky compose religious music?[44] Why did Tolstoy "search for God"?[45] This is the reason, perhaps, why the magazine *Voprosy filosofii* has tried recently to review the position of Marxism-Leninism regarding religion.[46] The Soviet press, too, has recently stepped up its battle against religious faith. The official journal of the Party's Central Committee, *Kommunist,* recently carried the headline "To Strengthen the Scientific-Atheistic Program."[47] Another journal, *Molodoy kommunist,* stated that Christianity and Communism will never be compatible.[48] The demand that believers be excluded from membership in the Party was put forth strongly in *Partiynaya zhizn*: "Communists who have not broken with religious superstitions have no place in the Party. We have to denounce definitely the attitude of toleration and permissiveness which still is maintained by some Party organizations and by some individual Communists. This duty should be imposed also on young members of the Komsomol organizations."[49] It is obvious that the Party will fight vigorously to prevent the establishment of God in the hearts and minds of the young generations.

6. The Teaching of History in Soviet Schools: A Study in Methods

by WILLIAM K. MEDLIN

The history of ideas and institutions constitutes perhaps the most crucial element in the framework of the educational process through which young people pass. The principles employed by educators in their selections of educational materials and their pedagogical methods in this field are, therefore, of capital importance. The great strides made by the Soviet Union toward general education for the masses invite our careful examination of the history teaching program required by the Soviet educational system.

In principle, and especially in a highly centralized political system exercising total control over education, a study of teaching methods ought to include all the elements entering into the educational process for a given discipline. The scope of methodology, therefore, focuses our attention on three fundamental features of the historical discipline: materials and sources; principles of historiography; and methods of presentation. It is principally around these features that this discussion of the teaching of history in the U.S.S.R. will move.[1] This essay is basically descriptive, with attention to actual practices to the extent that data from personal experiences have become available.

Before entering directly into the Soviet teaching question, it is appropriate to give some consideration to Russian historical traditions prior to the Bolshevik accession to power in November, 1917. This approach is useful, not only because Soviet historians have continued to honor some elements of those traditions, but

also because, as will be shown later, their own methodological principles imply and even require the use of earlier Russian works as necessary to Soviet historical science. Although no known official Soviet statement either endorses the views of prerevolutionary historians or specifically requires Soviet teachers to reinterpret statements inconsistent with Soviet teachings, available information from former Soviet teachers and students indicates that this question has not created any particular problem in the Soviet history class, and that in the final analysis the "official" historical interpretation is upheld. This point was borne out by visits to Russian history classes in the U.S.S.R. made by this writer in the spring of 1959.

Historiography as a scholarly and scientific endeavor developed in Russia during the nineteenth century. The earliest outstanding attempt to record history systematically and with some discretion as to source materials was that made by N. M. Karamzin. However, his twelve-volume opus on Russian history (1816-29), not unlike earlier works, was essentially a restatement of Russian chronicles and later records. Not until the second half of the nineteenth century was the master work attempted. Sergei Mikhailovich Solovyev, the great compiler and synthesizer of Russian historical materials, wrote twenty-nine volumes and a general index which remain today an indispensable source, archival guide, and research tool for the student of Russian history. During this period and the first two decades of the twentieth century, a number of Russian scholars, particularly V. O. Klyuchevsky, M. M. Kovalevsky, V. S. Ikonnikov, F. I. Uspensky, N. F. Kapterev, P. N. Milyukov, and S. F. Platonov, firmly established the Russian historical tradition. Except for brief periods and under special dispensations, these historians worked under the hardship of state censorship. Under the new Soviet government, censorship has continued to exercise constant control over Russian historiographers during the past forty years.

Another prominent feature of Russian historiography has been its strong eschatological content. In Russian history, the theme that Russian civilization will consummate the mission of

bringing a final solution, or salvation, to man and his problems reverberates through the centuries. This aspiration became particularly vocal in the sixteenth century through the predications and writings of the cleric Iosif Volotsky.[2] Later historiographical materials reiterated similar themes calling for the fulfillment of a world mission.[3] The influence of this tradition has not abated during the Soviet period. In fact, it has been restated in terms of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Source Materials for Teaching History

There are two distinct general categories of source materials for teaching history in Soviet schools—the formal, or officially "correct," sources, and the informal, or unofficial, materials. The first category includes the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and the statements (decrees, resolutions, declarations, etc.) of the Soviet Communist Party and of the government. In addition, there is the officially published or approved encyclopedic, monographic (including program and textbook), and periodical literature. All these materials are carefully censored to ensure conformity with current government policies. In line with this conformity, the editorials of the daily and monthly press are intended to serve as guides in the elaboration of all cultural and intellectual activity. Some historical writings of pre- and non-Soviet authors are sometimes included in official reading lists and bibliographies.

Unofficial sources include the major historical works and literary classics of prerevolutionary times. Among these, the brilliant work on the history of Russia by Klyuchevsky is perhaps outstanding. Originally conceived and composed as a series of lectures on social history at Moscow University, the clearly outlined chapters of his work have appeared in three editions during the Soviet period, and so they are available to any serious student of history. Solovyev's work has not been republished since the Revolution, but along with many other prerevolutionary works, it is available at the major libraries and in private collections. The

Soviet attempt at a comprehensive bibliography of scholarly writings, the *Fundamentalnaya biblioteka*,[4] lists S. M. Solovyev and others as authors of major sources. The availability of statistical and other compilations published by the Soviet government, especially in recent years, provides considerable source materials. The large numbers of *spravochniki, narodnoe,* and *kulturnoe stroitelstvo* series, *sborniki,* etc., which the Soviet press has issued contain much significant, objective data. Certainly there are limitations and controls on the uses to which these data may be put by individual scholars, but this detailed information can be analyzed and studied for one's personal edification and satisfaction, if for no other reason.

The state archives and former private institutional archives are further sources of research materials. Access to certain government and Party archival holdings is tightly controlled, and graduate students and directors of research make the most use of the archives. If they wish to publish, their interpretations must naturally conform to current Soviet views on the subject. A further and steadily growing source category is foreign literature imported into the U.S.S.R. Selections, purchases, and to some extent gifts and exchanges are subject to governmental review. Nonetheless, there is evidence that significant use is made of foreign literature, particularly scientific and pedagogical materials.[5] Large quantities of non-Russian periodical literature in the scientific and technical fields, especially in the English language, are received regularly and translated into Russian. Lastly, if one reads the officially approved educational literature for Soviet schools carefully, one can find references, statements, and data which do not conform to Marxist-Leninist teachings on dialectical and historical materialism and which constitute objective knowledge.[6]

Principles of Soviet Historiography

The writing of history is of the highest ideological importance and comes under careful government scrutiny. In the R.S.F.S.R.,

research and publishing by historians assume an official character through powers exercised by the Ministry of Education and by sub-committees of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.[7] Historiography, therefore, reflects official policy.

Russian historiographers are taught that historical concepts and principles can be formed in two ways. One is through the exercise of logic, whereby one recognizes which things or happenings are "accidental and (which are) typical."[8] This process enables historians to sort out and classify vast amounts of historical data. The second method (which is, in fact, an extension of the logical method) consists in making a "successive record of historical events," so as to accumulate conceptual categories of historical information.

The history of all things is related to dialectical and historical materialism which, in the Soviet Union, is defined according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.[9] All history textbooks and literature must be based on these teachings and must refer to them as sources for major principles and interpretations. One of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism is the assertion that life and consciousness are, in substance, matter in motion or movement. Acceptance of this principle in historiography precludes recognition of a metaphysical or spiritual conception of historical processes. Philosophical as well as historical constructions tend to shift with Soviet policy, so that Party principles (*partiynost*) and the current Party line have priority in deciding the shape of all creative work.

Historiography must also inculcate patriotism and pride in the homeland. This principle has been observed rigidly in the writing of Soviet history during the past twenty years. Soviet historiography recognizes five major periods of social history as forming the methodological framework for research and writing: primitive society characterized by mixed communal (communistic) and individual property-owning habits; the ancient slaveholding civilizations; the medieval, feudal period; the modern period of nation-states where private capitalism predominates; and the "present" stage of historical development characterized by so-

cialism, which is in transition to Communism. These categories define the organization and general content of history textbooks and studies.[10]

Methodology has been employed by Soviet historians in different ways at different times. One can distinguish four periods in the development of history writing and teaching in Russia since the November, 1917, Revolution. The period immediately following the Revolution and up to the early thirties was dominated by the Pokrovsky school. M. N. Pokrovsky,[11] a prominent Marxist historian prior to 1917, elaborated the fundamentals of Soviet history teaching and, in 1920, published the official history textbook, *Russkaya istoriya v samom szhatom ocherke*. This book appeared in many editions thereafter. The Pokrovsky school held that Russian national experience is characterized by basic socio-economic forms which are common to all nations in the course of their development. These forms differ according to the stage of a society's historical evolution, and they appear in all countries. Pokrovsky insisted that Russia is not peculiar among the family of nations and that it is governed by the same universal laws that govern all peoples. He further held that national history is merely the fractionalization of world history, an episode in the universal picture, and can only be correctly understood in its relationship to other histories and cultures. The major theoretical effect of the Pokrovsky interpretation of history was the elevation of Marxian dialectical and historical-materialism as a governing factor over and above the national, historic Russian traditions and forces. To put it more bluntly, Pokrovsky subordinated the historical processes in Russia to an alien doctrine, i.e., Marxism.

In the late twenties, and again in 1931, unsuccessful efforts were made to alter the teachings advanced by the Pokrovsky school. A special commission of the Communist Party composed of Stalin, S. M. Kirov, and A. A. Zhdanov determined to reorganize the methods of interpreting and teaching history in Soviet schools.[12] As a result, the Party and government passed a decree on May 16, 1934, which defined the new form and substance of history teaching.[13] This decree purported to accomplish two major

things: to eliminate the principles of both prerevolutionary and early Soviet historiography as being prejudicial to historical science, and to establish a new interpretation and methodology of history. New textbooks were ordered written for the 1935-36 school year, and the universities of Moscow and Leningrad reopened their history departments by admitting up to 150 students each for a five-year course.[14] The new "line" on history gave greater recognition to the importance of national forces and developments in the historical process, sacrificing to a considerable extent the universal socio-economic principles popularized by the Pokrovsky school. By this time Lenin—his writings, personality, and legend—had become the centerpiece of Soviet historical constructions.

This process of "nationalizing" history was intensified after 1938, the last year of the Great Purges, and was symbolized particularly well by the publication, in 1938, of the *History of the All-Union Communist Party (b), Short Course*. In this work, the history of the Revolution and of the Soviet regime receives a Stalinist reinterpretation. This new interpretation also was instrumental in elevating national and local historical forms over universal and general forms while retaining the language of historical materialism. Nationalistic tendencies began to exert great influence on history writing during and after World War II, when old Russian traditions were glorified, and when (after 1946) Russian "separateness" from Western traditions was pushed to extremes. The process continued to develop thereafter, centering more and more on Stalin's life and activities, while Lenin's figure moved into the background. Reviewing the trends at work over the decades after 1920, one is impressed with the relative triumph of nationalism over universalism in Soviet historical methodology.[15]

Stalin's death in 1953 marked the beginning of another major reinterpretation of Soviet history. Since then, historians have begun to minimize the importance of the biographic method, especially insofar as Stalin is concerned, and have emphasized the principal role of peoples in historical development. The

framework of the new methods is not yet clear, and there has been considerable evidence in the Soviet press of confusion and lack of spontaneity regarding the readjustments.[16] In any case, Soviet law requires that the schools re-educate students on the role of personalities in history.[17]

Methods of Teaching History in the Classroom

The general methodology which Soviet teachers of history follow is governed by criteria common to American as well as other schools of thought.[18] Essentially, these are that teaching methods are governed by the content and nature of the historical material to be studied; by the education, training, experience, and temperament of the teacher; and by the kinds of students composing the class. Although Soviet students of methods do not make a special point of it, it is obvious that the philosophy of history employed by them guides their interpretations and ought to be included among their criteria.

Soviet methodology is conceived to have definite aims. It must be used to determine not only the educational but also the indoctrinational properties of history. The elements of historical knowledge and of teaching techniques are to be bent, so to speak, to these ends. In terms of indoctrination, history must give the student a Communist world view. Methodology must demonstrate that history actually bears out the evolution of society toward Communist forms. The tool for these purposes is stated to be the "creation by Marx and Engels of the revolutionary teaching of the development of society."[19]

History teachers are told by Soviet-Russian methodologists that if historical data are clearly presented and concretely discussed, children in the fifth and sixth grades of the ten-year school (that is, at the ages of twelve and thirteen) can understand the most complicated generalizations about the historical process. The teaching of cultural history is considered an important aspect of general history, not to be neglected or sacrificed for other elements of the history program. Since the ownership of the

means of production and the class structure of society are conceived to be the decisive factors in history, these principles are supposed to receive overriding emphasis.

Some of the common techniques which Soviet history teachers are encouraged to use in rendering the history lessons effective are: focusing pupils' attention on single, important facts or events; describing major social or political movements (e.g., the rise of a merchant class); making generalizations about the character of certain happenings or developments (e.g., the rebellion headed by Cromwell in the seventeenth century); and employing classroom activities for indoctrinating youngsters with Communist ideas. For indoctrination purposes, Soviet methodologists insist that the "fundamental turning point for the teaching of history" in Russia was the October Revolution.[20]

Soviet history pedagogues make some but not intensive use of the integrated, or "mixed," social-studies program widely used in the United States, whereby history, geography, sociology, and economics are integrated into one textbook. Some of all these elements enter into Soviet textbooks by the very nature of history, but their contents, just as the course programs, are much more subject-centered than are the teaching materials used in American social-studies courses.

A beginning effort to teach important historical concepts to children is begun in grades two and three, where the primers contain references to significant events and dates in Soviet history. In calling these data to the attention of the little ones, teachers are supposed to initiate the molding of a general historical framework. In the fourth grade, the history of the U.S.S.R. as a first-cycle course is introduced systematically with a textbook and two hours of instruction per week. At this stage in the child's educational experience, the aims of history teaching are to tell of the past of the homeland, to foster social duty to the community, to stimulate the social emotions, to nourish the patriotic sentiments, and to develop a sense of the historical process.

In the higher grades (five to ten) pupils take courses in the

history of ancient times, the Middle Ages, and the modern period in important areas of the world. They also get a three-year course in Soviet history (second cycle). At these levels, more complicated instruction methods are employed with respect to both the organization of the course program and the writing of history. The basic methods used, which are fairly common to historians, are the synchronized and horizontal construction, and the concentric and vertical construction. Under the first method, Soviet historians present history in different stages in different countries. For the medieval period, for example, feudalism is taught "horizontally" by describing the institutions which existed in the areas later called France, England, and Germany, in the Byzantine (East Roman) Empire, etc. Through this method, a knowledge of both the common and the dissimilar features of social, political, and economic life in the various countries may be acquired, and Russian history may be compared to history elsewhere.

Under the concentric and vertical method, the entire historical account of one country or people is presented in sequence. This technique is primarily used for teaching the history of the U.S.S.R. in grades eight to ten. An element of the concentric method may also be to select a major form, such as a biographic theme (Lenin, Stalin, the Czars, etc.), around which a general historical treatment is given. Other major forms might be an ethnic community, a social class, a military theme, etc. In the textbooks on U.S.S.R. history some of these devices are used occasionally as part of the over-all vertical treatment. The kinds of concentric constructions mentioned are employed by Soviet historians in a manner that serves the social and economic doctrinal generalizations derived from the most recent interpretations of Marxism-Leninism.

Soviet history methodology classifies countries according to their "leading role" in the five periods of historical process. A particular country, ancient Egypt, for example, is selected for study because its place in history at that time is interpreted by

the Soviet school of history as being particularly significant. The subsequent history of the Egyptians is not considered important, so the textbook contains no further material on that country. Other nations are treated in similar fashion. The key to this type of history teaching program is, of course, historical materialism —the selective criterion.

The U.S.S.R. history textbooks for secondary schools do not require heavy reading assignments. During the first year (grade eight), when Russian history from ancient times to 1675 is covered, the pupil is required to prepare an average of one and one-half pages for each hour of instruction; in the ninth grade, covering the period 1675-1900, approximately two and one-half pages per class hour must be done; and during the last year, for the period 1900 to date, about two pages per instruction hour are required. This U.S.S.R. history course is not a history of the various peoples (Ukrainians, Belorussians, Kazakhs, etc.) that compose the Soviet Union, but rather a general history focusing its attention principally on the history of the Russian nation. Some material is presented about the minority peoples, but it is confined primarily to their history at the time of, and following, their incorporation into the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union.

History teachers drill pupils systematically and in stages on the meaning and use of special terms. For example, in the fifth grade the concepts of "government," "religion," "aristocracy," "republic," and so forth, are introduced and explained with regard to their particular uses and meanings in different societies (ancient, medieval, English, Russian, etc.). The use of chronological tables or similar arrangements, maps included with the textbooks, pictures and artistic works, and selections of original (or facsimile) documentary materials are among the methods employed to make history lessons easier to learn and more attractive to both teacher and pupil. Visual aids of various forms, in addition to those already mentioned, are also employed.[21]

One of the constant preoccupations of Soviet educators is how to stimulate pupil and teacher interest and effort in the study of history, that history which is made to conform to

prevalent, preconceived notions. In this matter, as well as in some other pedagogical methods, the authorities occasionally turn to prerevolutionary writings to recapture the spirit of earlier Russian thinkers and writers in the educational field. Although such persons were generally not influenced by Marxist philosophy, Soviet teachers nonetheless sometimes find their ideas useful for their purposes. One such writer–educator of the nineteenth century was K. D. Ushinsky. In a widely used Soviet teaching aid for history teachers, one of Ushinsky's exhortations, made in 1860 to young Russian pedagogues, is quoted at length by editors:

> You must, you are obliged, to kindle in your heart not the dreams of worldly cares . . ., but rather a pure flame, an unquenchable and undying thirst for the acquisition of knowledge, and to develop above all in yourself a love for work. Without this, your life will not be worthy of respect or happiness. Labor elevates your mind, ennobles your heart. . . . Constant mental labor unfolds in your soul a very pure and serene love for your neighbor, and only such love yields honest, noble, and true happiness. . . . Each one may achieve this, the greatest happiness on earth . . .; we may consider each person to be the tailor of his own happiness.[22]

This evocative passage was not chosen carelessly by Soviet educators. Its moralizing phrases suggest, at least to this writer, that such educational materials are intended to give intellectual nourishment to Soviet teachers who must work in an otherwise sterile atmosphere.

There remains a highly important element in the methods of presenting history in the classroom that requires consideration: the examination. The way in which pupils' knowledge of history is examined at the end of the Soviet ten-year school provides a kind of index to the historical information to which Soviet educational authorities expect the schools to devote the most serious attention. Coming after some six years of formal instruction in the history class, the final exam in history is, surprisingly enough, devoted entirely to subjects of recent Soviet-Russian history and

especially to developments connected with the Russian Social-Democratic Labor (later Communist) Party.[23] There are thirty questions in the examination, each of which has two parts, and all of these concern events which have taken place since the late nineteenth century. Over 70 per cent of the questions have to do with the political and social events of the Lenin period, while the other 30 per cent deal with more recent history, from about 1925 to 1956. There are no questions whatever on ancient or medieval history, nor are there any about the history of other countries during the modern period. The unmistakable orientation of this examination immediately prompts the question whether or not teacher and student are inclined to focus their attention, at least during the last year of high school, on the history of the Russian revolutionary movement, on conditions which brought about the overthrow of the imperial Russian regime, and on the period of Soviet rule, to the complete exclusion of other important historical data. This glaring neglect of non-Russian and non-Soviet history in the ten-year examination is more than a shortcoming: it is a pitiful distortion of the principles of history teaching and, indirectly, of the historical method. One can only conclude that a verification of the students' knowledge of history is not achieved through the Soviet school's final examination.

Training of History Teachers for Grades Five to Ten

Some consideration needs to be given here to the Soviet program for the training of history teachers in the secondary school. There are two kinds of institutions for this purpose, each with its own program: the pedagogical institute (*Pedagogichesky institut*) and the university (*Universitet*). Both schools offer a five-year course based on completion of the secondary school and the receipt of the certificate of maturity. At the pedagogical institute, history training is combined with studies in Russian language and literature. The university program, however, is structured for the history discipline only, although some courses in languages and other subjects are also required.

The subject, written work, and examination patterns are designed and weighted very differently from the normal practices of American teacher-training schools. This variance is particularly marked in the Soviet university program where, at least in form, the curriculum is heavily weighted on the side of the major subject, history. American programs are not so weighted, and they offer a more evenly balanced pattern of subject matter, in terms of general education, with decidedly more emphasis on courses in education, methodology, and psychology.

The grouping of courses by general disciplines in official Soviet study plans for 1957 demonstrates the balance in curricular structure. The details are presented in a table on p. 114.

The structures of these programs reveal the pedagogical aim to produce a teacher well grounded in his or her major subject. This observation applies more particularly to the university-trained teacher, and it rests on the premise that the best teacher is the one who has the best grasp or soundest knowledge of his field. This training approach obviously has certain advantages, in terms of knowledgeability and also of teaching skills, for a learned teacher will, other things being equal, have greater command of methods than a poorly prepared history teacher, no matter how many additional hours of formal methodology the latter may have had.[24] The teacher who has received university training is destined primarily for teaching the more advanced history subjects in grades eight to ten in the secondary schools.

The structural aspects of this program, while interesting, should not detract attention from certain of its other features. Notable among these is the fact that, notwithstanding the seemingly low percentage of time devoted to dialectical and historical materialism and its most closely related subjects, much of the content of history courses is either drawn from or based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. The detailing of this factor would naturally raise the percentage devoted to those teachings in each of the programs cited and would also tend to erase the artificial demarcation lines which we erected for illustrative purposes. It is likewise consistent to point out that some data learned

Pedagogical Institutes[a]			Subject Groups	University of Moscow[b]		
Total semester hours	Lectures	Practical		Total semester hours	Lectures	Practical
			I			
160	106	54	Ancient history	150	78	72
178	108	70	History of the Middle Ages	136	76	60
—	—	—	History of southern and western Slavs	84	84	—
264	174	90	Modern history	304	220	84
106	86	20	History of the East	170	170	—
430	290	140	History of the U.S.S.R.	460	240	220
224	120	104	History of the C.P.S.U.	224	144	80
1362	884	478	7 Subjects	1528	1012	516
(= 31 per cent of curriculum)				(= 45 per cent of curriculum)		
			II			
64	32	32	Methods of teaching history	50	30	20
120	70	50	Pedagogy	64	—	—
72	54	18	History of pedagogy	—	—	—
84	50	34	Psychology	36	20	16
—	—	—[c]	Archaeology	40	—	—
100	—	—	Special activities[d]	—	—	—[e]
(16 weeks)			Teacher training[f]	60	(6 weeks)	
440	306	134	7 Subjects	250	214	36
(= 10 per cent of curriculum)				(= 7 per cent of curriculum)		
			III			
140	80	60	Dialectical and historical materialism	140	80	60
140	98	42	Political economy	212	112	100
70	44	26	Logic	—	—	—
—	—	—	History of philosophy	70	—	—
350	222	128	4 Subjects	422	262	160
(= 8 per cent of curriculum)				(= 12 per cent of curriculum)		

[a] The total number of semester hours at pedagogical institutes is 4,434.

[b] The total number of semester hours at universities is 3,460.

[c] Three additional weeks are scheduled for summer training at Pioneer camps.

[d] Supervised experience in conducting extracurricular and extrascholastic activities.

[e] Another five weeks are spent on archival, museum, and monuments-research and training.

[f] The time spent, in terms of total semester hours, is not available and is not, in this study, considered as a part of the curricular program.

The other portions of scheduled class work in these two programs, 51 per cent and 36 per cent respectively, are variously devoted to languages, literature, physical education, and electives.

through the study of the subjects listed under Group III would fall outside the definitions of Marxist-Leninist teachings. They are objective data which, independently taken, have other than Marxist-Leninist educational values. This is to say that while one cannot pretend that no scientific, historical knowledge whatever is acquired in Soviet history courses, it is important to note that, for the most part, Marxist interpretations of history are predominant throughout the educational experience.

Another point pertinent to the question of curricular balance is the distribution of elective courses in both programs. Amounting to nearly 600 hours in the course of study at Moscow University, and to an indefinite number (over 300) in the program at pedagogical institutes, these subjects could well increase the total number of hours taken in one or the other—or all—of the three groups of courses under discussion.

Conclusions

Although Soviet historiographical methods continue to be partly guided by some of the traditions of Russian historical science, political demands of the government continue to hold the veil of Marxian dialectical materialism over them and have seriously limited the influences which such traditions might otherwise have on the educational processes. The shift since 1918 in historical interpretation from a fundamentally Marxist approach to one strongly mixed with nationalistic and traditional values has unfortunately not brought about an all-round improvement in Soviet historiography, since political considerations require the subservience of scholarship to the state.

While Soviet methodologists use well-known principles in history writing and teaching, the official teaching materials and the examinations are so designed that the principles are distorted in their pedagogical application. The inclusion of much objective historical data tends to be reinterpreted by textbook and teacher in order to suit philosophical dogma or current political views. The question may be raised, but not answered, as to what amount of historical information the student and teacher may interpret

in their own way within the precincts of their consciences. History has shown that such intellectual activity may be an unknown but yet potent factor influencing the shape of things to come.

Both the curricular and individual course structures of the history program in Soviet schools, following the European educational tradition, focus on the subject. The methods used aim at the acquisition of definite, measurable quantities of historical information. The interrelationships of this information with other disciplines are reserved for later emphasis at a higher academic level or through life experience. The training of history teachers, too, is much less concerned with the general, non-subject aspects of pedagogy than it is with mastering the subject matter to be taught in classrooms. These features are perhaps the most interesting ones for the purposes of comparative education, for they enable us to view structurally the Soviet scheme of history training without concerning ourselves with obvious deficiencies in the actual content of that training. On this point it seems that the Soviet plan perhaps better equips the student and teacher to do the job required than do some other plans or systems. A final statement on this question ought, however, to await a careful verification of the Soviet history program by observing it in actual practice.

7. Notes on Foreign-Language Teaching in the U.S.S.R.[1]

by DAVID BURG

It is generally believed abroad that the Russian people have a special talent for foreign languages. That opinion is inaccurate and is based upon the following misconception. Foreign-language teaching was on a very high level in prerevolutionary Russia. Gymnasium graduates spoke at least one Western European language, usually French or German, fluently. A foreign governess was a must in every family of means. On the other hand, the Gymnasium was definitely not a mass institution such as the contemporary American or Soviet schools are. Only a relatively small percentage of school-age children attended and completed a Gymnasium. At the same time, foreigners visiting Russia came in contact almost exclusively with Gymnasium graduates and members of the privileged class. This fact gave rise to the legend that Russians have a special aptitude for languages. As a matter of fact, today only a very small percentage among the educated really master any foreign language.

To begin with, the Revolution literally destroyed the old school. It was reestablished after fifteen years, but then as a mass-education institution. The years from 1917 to about 1932-34 were years of educational chaos in general, and in foreign-language teaching in particular. During this period, the teaching of foreign languages practically ceased. The first Soviet foreign-language textbooks only appeared at the very end of the nineteen-twenties.

Only after the educational reforms of 1932-34 did foreign

languages once again occupy a solid place in the curriculum of the Soviet school. This also created the problem of preparing teachers. In the mid-thirties, literally dozens of institutes specializing in foreign languages and departments of foreign languages in pedagogical institutes were set up. By 1958, a well-developed system of foreign-language instruction had been established in the U.S.S.R. Before undertaking a description of this system and its methods and the results it has attained, one must consider two specific problems related to foreign-language teaching. These problems are peculiar to the U.S.S.R. and have had great influence upon foreign-language teaching in the system of Soviet education.

First, there is a political problem. The "bourgeois influence upon the youth" has seriously disturbed the leaders of the Soviet Union, especially in recent years. At the Twenty-first Congress of the Party, Khrushchev said: "Some officials underestimate the harm of the bourgeois influence upon Soviet youth, since the bourgeoisie is far away from us and can have no influence on our youth. But that is a delusion. We cannot ignore the possibility of bourgeois influence and are bound to fight against it and against the infiltration of alien ideas and customs into the midst of Soviet people and especially of youth."[2] A knowledge of one of the three main foreign languages taught in Soviet schools (English, French, and German) greatly facilitates the access to such sources of bourgeois influence as foreign broadcasts, foreign literature, and periodicals which are now available to a limited degree. On the other hand, it is impossible to eliminate the study of foreign languages altogether, partly for reasons of prestige, but mainly because highly trained scientific, technical, and other specialists, without whom modern society cannot survive, simply cannot do their work properly without an opportunity to follow what is being accomplished in their fields in foreign countries. Such is the political dilemma facing a totalitarian regime. It cannot really be resolved fully, and as a result, the policy vacillates, stressing first one consideration and then the other. As will be

seen later, these zigzags influence the methods and aims of foreign-language teaching.

The second problem, unique to the Soviet Union, which bears upon the study of foreign languages is that in the national republics there exists the problem of linguistic overlap. Take, for example, an Armenian school located in Georgia. Four languages are studied in it: Armenian, Georgian, Russian, and one foreign language. The study of three languages—the native tongue, Russian, and one foreign language—is quite common. Naturally, this puts a greater burden on the pupils in national republic schools than on the pupils in the R.S.F.S.R. In Georgia, an eleventh year was therefore introduced in the schools some time ago. In the theses of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. published in November, 1958—"On Strengthening the Bond between Schools and Life"—an effort was made to resolve radically the problem of pupils in national republic schools who are overburdened with language study. The teaching of the Russian language in the nationality schools and of a national language in Russian schools was made optional. Furthermore, the theses state: "It is necessary to forego the inclusion of a foreign language among the required subjects in schools where suitable conditions for such teaching do not exist."[3] One must doubt whether this last proposition will actually be effected, in view of the fact that every institution of higher learning requires prior study of a foreign language. Higher institutions will admit students having no preparation in a foreign language very reluctantly. Secondary-school pupils therefore will be compelled to study a foreign tongue as they have done in the past. The study of the national language is more likely to be sacrificed. As a result, one can hardly anticipate any substantial letup in the teaching of foreign languages in the U.S.S.R. in the next few years, nor will there be great changes in the system of teaching evolved over the last twenty-five years. The reform in the Soviet school, in the modest form in which it appears in the law passed on December 24, 1958, will not have any great effect upon

foreign-language study in the U.S.S.R. If, however, Khrushchev's original proposal had been accepted, a plan which fundamentally legislated the destruction of the full secondary general-education school, then there would have been no question that the teaching and study of foreign languages would have been seriously affected. But since the secondary school has been preserved, and with it the system of teaching foreign languages, the chief concern of this essay, the following description may be considered true not only for the past, but also for the present and future, or at least the near future.

Foreign-language teaching is conducted on three levels in the U.S.S.R.: in the secondary schools from the fifth to the tenth grade; in the institutions of higher learning not devoted to languages from the first to the fourth course or year; and in the so-called higher institutions of language study, where foreign languages are the chief object of study, during the course of five years.

In addition, foreign-language study is carried on in other than the above-mentioned three basic educational institutions. In the first place, there are special secondary schools where instruction in all or most subjects (except, of course, the Russian language and Russian literature) is carried on in one of the three chief Western European languages. The Soviet press reports only very sparingly and reluctantly about the activities of these schools.[4] The reason for this silence is that these schools, especially in Moscow, are attended by the scions of the Soviet aristocracy, and nothing touching the personal lives of this social group in the U.S.S.R. must ever see the pages of the public press. The author of this essay knows personally that the school located in Sokolniki section of Moscow, where all instruction is carried on in English, was attended by the children and relatives of Malenkov while he was Premier. The exact number and location of these schools is unknown. We may assume that the number is not great, but because of the importance of the pupils attending these schools, their influence far outweighs their numerical position in Soviet public education.

In the second place, some Soviet intellectual families, carrying on a prerevolutionary tradition, consider it necessary to teach their children foreign languages at their own expense with the help of private tutors. Since the war, the chief language so taught has been English. This is a rather expensive way of teaching and only a very few can afford it. Private lessons in Moscow cost from twenty to fifty rubles per hour, the latter if taken from a "genuine" foreigner. However, this is probably the most effective method of instruction.

In the third place, in the larger cities it is possible to attend foreign-language courses (usually lasting two years). The tuition fees for these courses are reasonable, and they are always overcrowded. They may be compared to similar institutions in the West, but they use a conservative method of instruction. The courses emphasize the ability to read and understand a foreign text, along with a small amount of conversation.

The three categories mentioned above constitute the auxiliary means of studying foreign languages in the Soviet Union. The first two give a degree of mastery unattainable in any mass-educational institution. All three supplement the main types of pedagogical institutions carrying on language teaching.

The largest mass-educational institution carrying on language instruction is the general-education secondary school, where, beginning with the fifth grade, one foreign language is taught. As Khrushchev said, 80 per cent of Soviet youth now completes seven grades.[5] This means that, with certain exceptions, 80 per cent of Soviet young people of both sexes have contact with a foreign language in one way or another. It is necessary to interpose a *caveat*, however, against sensational deductions from such a statistic: contact with a foreign language during the course of three years by no means signifies that a graduate of a seven-year school is even capable of reading the most elementary text in a foreign language. Approximately 40 per cent of those admitted to the first grade complete the secondary school, and consequently study a foreign language for six years. The results of this study will be discussed below. Most Soviet pupils study the

English language. After English comes German and then, French. During recent times, chiefly in some schools of the Central Asian republics, the study of Asian languages (Chinese, Hindi, etc.) has been introduced.

Foreign languages occupy a modest place in the curriculum of a Soviet school. At present, only 660 compulsory hours, or three to four hours per week, are devoted to a foreign language during the six-year course.[6] By comparison, eight to twelve hours a week are devoted to foreign-language study in countries such as Great Britain, Germany, or Belgium. Despite the paucity of hours spent in class, or perhaps because of this fact, even in Moscow, where the average is higher than in other parts of the country, the foreign-language course is considered by students to be "the toughest subject of them all."

There are two reasons for this. In the first place, between 1934 and 1957, the number of hours devoted to foreign-language study was reduced by a third, from 954 to 660 hours.[7] Meanwhile, due to the improvement in the teachers' qualifications, demands upon the pupils did not decrease. In the second place, the purpose of foreign-language teaching has always been vague and is subject to constant change. In the programs of the first half of the thirties, this aim was stated very indefinitely as "assuring knowledge of a foreign language" which was to be attained by making sure that the pupils obtained a vocabulary of 8,000 words(!). Anyone who has had any experience whatsoever in teaching knows that this is sheer fantasy. In the 1948 program, the objective was stated more clearly. Now the pupils were required "to be able to express themselves in writing and to translate texts of average difficulty on political or specialized subjects, with minimal recourse to a dictionary." For such high requirements, however, a knowledge of only 1,500 words was expected, a number which obviously does not assure comprehension of the texts mentioned in the program. In 1952, the number of required words rose to 4,000 words; later it declined to 2,400. The program presently in effect sets a goal which is

as modest as it is vague: that the pupil be able "to read and understand a foreign text." This aim is supported and considered reasonable by a number of Soviet writers.[8] However, Soviet language instructors are now planning a new program which presents as its fundamental purpose "to teach pupils to be able to carry on a discussion on ordinary social and political subjects."[9] Such constant radical changes naturally retard the teacher's ability to work out a solid method for instruction, and they likewise militate against much success by the pupils, who are asked to do one thing today and another tomorrow.

What is behind these continual changes in the end purpose set for language study? They come from the fact that Soviet specialists have been unable to agree among themselves as to why foreign languages should be taught. In this dispute, the political reasons alluded to earlier are clearly paramount. During the Stalin regime, when the U.S.S.R. was directed into complete isolation from the rest of the world, when foreign literature, even of a technical nature, was almost inaccessible, the paradoxical policy was that a foreign language was to be taught but not learned. The 1949 edition of the *Methodological Directions for the Foreign-Languages Program* states that the "study of a foreign language in the seven-year secondary school has as its purpose both upbringing and training." Karpov, a well-known expert on methodology, in his book *Methodology for Study of Languages in Elementary Schools,* expressed himself even more clearly: "Practical habit training as the chief and fundamental purpose of studying a foreign language in school inevitably led, and will always inevitably lead, foreign-language study into a blind alley."[10] In other words, despite the general formulations in the program, teachers actually were not supposed to teach pupils to be able to use a foreign language. Languages were studied for the sake of mental gymnastics ("training and educational purposes"), as though they were dead languages. A tremendous amount of time was spent on formal grammatical analysis in the course of which, as one Soviet writer notes, students took up "the

most difficult and sometimes even disputed points of grammar," without knowing the foreign equivalents of such words as "always," "come," "quietly," "victory," etc.

The so-called passive method was employed in secondary schools. Pupils learned a great number of grammatical rules and then constructed examples artificially on the basis of these rules with the simplest words. Words were learned without any connection to each other. The technique of comparing the native language with the foreign language was widely used. Kolmakov, an expert on methodology, noted: "Soviet methodology finds the comparative method most effective, because it assures a conscious mastery of the foreign language."[11] As this quotation indicates, stress was placed on consciousness along with comparison. A subconscious assimilation of a language leading to the practical mastery of it as the end result of knowledge gained on the basis of much repetition was rejected on the pretext that it requires more time than the schools are able to devote to it. Lempert points to the essential deficiencies of the passive method in an article, "Essential Problems of Methodology in the Study of Foreign Languages." He writes:

> During lessons in class . . . one hears much discussion about this or that point of a foreign language, but the discussions are never carried on in that language. What do such lessons contribute to a mastery of a foreign language?[12]

During the years after Stalin's death, when Soviet isolation weakened and the demand for specialists who knew the foreign literature in their fields grew, a decisive practical reorientation took place in foreign-language teaching, at least in the programs, as noted above. But, inevitably, it will take some time before pupils actually begin to study in a different manner and become accustomed to the new methods. While, during Stalin's time, the schools imparted to pupils a knowledge about a foreign language, they now seek to give pupils the requisites for knowing a language, using knowledge about the language only as an aid to

achieving that purpose. With such a change of purpose, the methods of teaching must also change.

The center of gravity, so to speak, is now shifting to the so-called active method, which is intended, as Soviet pedagogues tell us, to achieve a "productive" (practical) mastery of a language. The principle of conscious assimilation is retained, but to a lesser degree. More attention must now be paid to establishing habits of repetition and practice and to increasing the pupils' vocabulary. Grammar will be simplified and will be used merely as an aid rather than as an end in itself. The details of application of these methods are still subject to much discussion, but these fine points are best eschewed here.

One might ask: What have been the results of foreign-language study in the Soviet schools under conditions of constantly changing methods and vague purposes? Z. M. Tsvetkova begins her article "On Improving the Quality of Foreign Language Instruction in the Secondary and Higher Schools" as follows:

> For more than twenty-five years, foreign languages have been a required subject in the Soviet school. However, most graduates lack sufficient mastery of a foreign language to enable them either to read any foreign literature or to undertake personal oral or written contact with foreigners without the assistance of an interpreter.[13]

On the basis of abundant material, Kuzina also makes the same point in her article "Raise the Quality of Foreign-Language Teaching in the School."[14] In addition to the absence of stable purposes and methods of foreign-language teaching, the following reasons are given for backwardness in this field: insufficient class hours, overcrowded classes (forty to forty-five students in a class), treating foreign-language study as a secondary subject, the lack of good textbooks, absence of an incentive to learn a foreign language, and finally, as one of the basic reasons, an insufficient number of specially trained teachers coupled with the

poor quality of the preparation of those teachers who have had special training. Kuzina's article cites the following figures: In the Penza Oblast, during the 1956-57 school year, only 172 out of 822 foreign-language teachers had normal-school training, 131 completed a two-year course for interpreters, and the remaining 419 had no specialized training at all. The article concludes:

> Alongside experienced and knowledgeable teachers of foreign languages, one frequently finds teachers of history, singing, physical education, who know neither the foreign language nor how to teach it.

The explanation for these uncomfortable facts may be found in an examination of the scope and especially of the method of training of foreign-language teachers in the U.S.S.R. In the Russian Republic, there were twenty-nine faculties of foreign languages during the 1957-58 school year, twenty-six philological faculties with departments for foreign languages, and three institutes of foreign languages (in Moscow, Leningrad, and Gorki). Moreover, the study of foreign languages (not only European languages) was carried on, for example, in such institutes as the Foreign Relations Institute, the Foreign Trade Institute, the Institute of Oriental Studies, and other institutions of higher learning. The larger universities, too, offer courses in a great variety of languages, from English to Persian, from Spanish to Geez. Philologists and specialists on various countries are being trained in the special institutions of higher learning and in the larger universities. However, most of the institutions of higher learning which teach foreign languages as a profession must train secondary-school teachers in three languages—English, French, and German. Until recently, extensive training in Spanish was also carried on. But since Spanish has not been introduced into the secondary schools, it has been impossible to teach Spanish on a mass scale.

The aim of foreign-language teaching in the institutions of higher learning teaching languages as a profession is the fluent mastery of a given language. The course of study lasts five

years. During this period, a student will have spent 2,236 classroom hours in practical training and 166 hours in theoretical training in a foreign-language department of a normal school, according to the Program for Foreign Languages for Normal Schools published in 1957. In universities, more time is allotted to theory. Practical training in a foreign language is carried on analytically "by aspects" or, in other words, by dividing the language into grammar, phonetics, reading, and translation. These are taught as separate subjects, usually by different instructors. About two years ago, a discussion about the pros and cons of this "aspect" method appeared in the pages of *Uchitelskaya gazeta*, but no practical changes resulted.

As may be seen, Soviet specialized journals and newspapers complain about the low level of teacher training in foreign languages. But a number of the more able students finish the institutes with a very thorough knowledge of and about the language and ability to use it fluently. Although they receive degrees as teachers, only with rare exceptions do these people actually become teachers themselves. The reason is the low pay and the relatively low prestige of teachers in society. The most able graduates of higher foreign-language institutes become research workers, translators, editors, and journalists; they work in military intelligence and in the censorship office. Only the average graduates, whose qualifications do not meet the requirements of more highly paid and more esteemed work, become teachers. This is why teachers of foreign languages are scarce, and why their work is poor.

The large number of poor and average students results from the fact that the shortage of able teachers is just as acute in the institutions of higher learning as it is in the secondary schools. Z. M. Tsvetkova in her above-quoted article (*see* note 13) notes "the absence in most institutions of higher learning of well-trained teachers of foreign languages who know their languages fluently, especially in the first and second years, where the basic speaking ability should be imparted." This situation is due partly to political factors: the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to invite teachers

from other countries to teach their native languages, as is common in the West; and the removal, between 1947 and 1949, of the foreign-born instructors of foreign languages who had lived in the U.S.S.R. for many years and even had become Soviet citizens. V. D. Arakin, one of the Soviet Union's outstanding specialists, in an article entitled "Problems of Improving the Preparation of Foreign-Language Teachers," outlines some further deficiencies of Soviet higher language schools as follows:

> Among the organizational deficiencies we include: (a) the ill-advised establishment of foreign-language departments in those normal schools that have neither the necessary teaching staff nor the proper base; (b) the dissipation of capable teachers into understaffed departments, instead of establishing strong departments with well-selected staffs of instructors and an adequate material base; (c) the inadequate equipment of language departments with modern technical apparatus; (d) the insufficient attention given the department by the directors of normal schools and their deputies who deal with academic and scientific work.
>
> Among the deficiencies in the teaching process itself we include: (a) an insufficiently articulated methodology on instruction of foreign languages in higher language institutes; (b) the absence of basic materials [for instruction] in each particular foreign language; (c) the absence of a publication or a magazine with a special orientation—in which basic methodological problems might be discussed; (d) the absence in institutes and departments of foreign languages of the necessary linguistic atmosphere which would surround the students at all hours; (e) the insufficient bond between student and school.[15]

This long passage is quoted because it clearly depicts the situation prevailing in Soviet higher language schools. Nothing need be added to this, except, perhaps, an explanation for the "insufficient bond between student and school." The connection of students with their school at present is limited to so-called pedagogical practical work, which means several weeks' attendance as a passive observer and handing in a number of lessons. Now it has been proposed that, before the issuance of a diploma,

every student should have to serve a year's probation as an instructor. However, so far this is only a proposal. One should also note that some institutes have evening and correspondence courses. Teachers who are already working have an opportunity to raise their qualifications in institutes for post-graduate study for teachers.

Generally speaking one may say the following concerning preparation of foreign-language specialists in the Soviet Union. Training for many kinds of specialists such as linguists, diplomats, translators, and area specialists is generally carried out very well. Not infrequently, students have a very good knowledge of the language studied. At the same time, the training of secondary-school teachers, often in the very same institutions of higher learning which train able translators, is unsatisfactory both in quantity and quality. The unsatisfactory preparation of teachers for the secondary schools in turn leads to a situation where institutions of higher learning are compelled to admit students who are ill-prepared in a foreign language, even from the point of view of secondary-school requirements. This, in turn, results in a low level of knowledge of students, thus creating a vicious circle.

One must also say a word about the teaching of foreign languages in institutions of higher learning which do not stress languages. Here the task is limited to teaching a student to read and understand a text dealing with his specialty, for example, a historian reading a historical text, or a metallurgist something about metallurgy—in short, to impart understanding of written material. Just as in the secondary schools, a foreign language is considered one of the most difficult subjects by the students of these institutions. It is, thus, obvious why it should be taught for the first two or three years. The difficulties which both students and teachers meet in trying to master a foreign language in institutions of higher learning not specializing in languages are primarily the result of the low level of knowledge which the secondary schools impart to students entering higher institutions. The level of the instruction here, however, is rel-

atively high. Here the instructors who may, comparatively speaking, not be fully qualified for higher language institutes are able to fulfill their tasks more satisfactorily. Relatively able people go to work in the institutions of higher learning not specializing in languages with far greater eagerness than in secondary schools, because the work is easier and the pay as well as the prestige is higher. But, of course, an ideal correlation between a good knowledge of language and competence in the major specialty of an institution is rare.

In correspondence with the purpose of language study in this area (acquisition of reading knowledge), the basic teaching method consists of exercises in reading and translation. A student is obliged to prepare and hand in an account of what he has read each semester and a translation of a definite number of pages. As a result of such instruction, the average student at the end of his course is able not so much to read in general as to understand specialized literature. Speaking of students in institutions of higher learning not specializing in languages, Academician Luria states: "I rarely met students (undergraduate or graduate) who, as a result of long preparation . . . had mastered a foreign language and were able to read and speak it fluently."[16] This is true, but the requirements that Luria mentions here for undergraduates and graduate students are not average requirements for an average institution of higher learning not specializing in languages.

There are thus three basic mass media for teaching foreign languages in the Soviet Union: the secondary schools; the institutions of higher learning specializing in languages; and institutions of higher learning not specializing in languages. In addition, foreign-language study is pursued by all graduate and postgraduate students. All *aspiranti*, before defending their dissertations for the first graduate academic degree of *kandidat*, are obliged to pass a special examination in one foreign language. If a foreign language happens to be their field of specialization, they must pass an examination in another foreign language which is not their specialty. The requirements for passing these exam-

inations are not very different from the requirements met by students in institutions of higher learning not specializing in languages.

By way of a brief summary one may say the following: the strength of the Soviet system of foreign-language training lies in its being widespread, in the fact that it embraces a tremendous number of people and forces them, to some extent at least, to come in contact with a foreign language. Its weakness is that only very few ever really obtain a good knowledge of a foreign tongue without supplementary study and outside pedagogical assistance. Especially damaging to the study of foreign languages were the postwar years during the Stalin regime, when, for political reasons, pupils were, in fact, prevented from learning a language in the course of their schooling. The recent *volte face* in the Soviet program in favor of practical knowledge may have a favorable effect upon the quality of future foreign-language teaching. But the danger remains that the zeal for "ideological purity" will put a quietus on the nascent rejuvenation, even before any practical results have been attained.

8. Extracurricular and Extrascholastic Activities for Soviet School Children[1]

by IRENE MAREUIL

All Soviet school children engage in extracurricular activities not specifically provided for in the secondary-school curriculum (*uchebny plan*) and conducted during after-school hours. Although the school bears the responsibility for the organization and success of the entire extracurricular program, only one element of this program is conducted by the school itself. In Soviet pedagogics this part of the program is called *vneklassnaya rabota* (out-of-school-hours activity), while the other main part, which consists of analogous activities and is conducted by special children's institutions, is called *vneshkolnaya rabota* (extrascholastic activity). The function of these Soviet children's institutions is to supplement the school in bringing up the future generations of Soviet citizens. According to official definition, they aid the school in "deepening the knowledge, in broadening the horizons, and in organizing intelligently the leisure" of Soviet children.

This very important aspect of Communist education is intended as a supplement to the basic school curriculum, regardless of whether it is directly associated with the school or conducted by special extrascholastic children's institutions.

The supplementary nature of extracurricular activities is clearly brought out in singing and drawing, for instance, both of which are allotted a place in the curriculum. Their purpose is to discover and foster either existing or potential artistic interests,

such as appreciation of music, choreography, and painting, which are not part of the curriculum.

During the forty years of its development, Soviet pedagogy has evolved a coherent system of extracurricular activities, beginning in the elementary schools and continuing into the seven- and ten-year schools. The system embraces various areas of knowledge and in terms of content may be divided into four broad categories: (a) scientific pursuits; (b) labor and technological training; (c) training in the arts; and (d) physical culture and sports. The Party, however, sees in all of these pursuits appropriate vehicles for the inculcation of political ideology and "Communist morality," for the major goal of the entire extracurricular enterprise is "the Communist upbringing of children in the spirit of patriotism, mutual help in learning, labor, and social activities." The following cardinal points emerge when looking at the theoretical writings of Soviet educators about the goals of extracurricular activities. Great stress is laid on the development of internationalist attitudes in pupils, of feelings of friendship and respect toward workers of all nationalities, feelings and attitudes which are effected through such concrete methods as organized correspondence, meetings, etc. In moral development, the program should be solicitous of the individual interests of the pupil, develop his creative potentialities, independence, initiative, and taste. In practical activities, care must be taken that these future adults will apply the knowledge of the sciences and arts they learn in school and after school.

In the organization of the extracurricular program, important roles are played by the Pioneer and Komsomol organizations, the student committees and their cultural commissions, the class elders, and the so-called culture organizers. A number of methods are used in organizing extracurricular activities: circles; mass competitions and assignments; individual reports, etc.

This essay will first discuss the extracurricular program within the school, and then go on to discuss the various types of extrascholastic institutions.

Extracurricular Activities in the Secondary School

Beginning with the third grade, the teacher is the organizer of all extracurricular activities. For the young children in the elementary grades, extracurricular activities are geared strictly to class lessons and are, in fact, an extension of these lessons. They include reading, and conversation about what has been read, dramatizations of episodes from the readings, nature excursions, and visits to museums. At this stage begins the work with the "young naturalists": observation of plants and animals and seasonal changes in nature. In the "dextrous hands" circles, children engage in handicrafts: they bind books, sew, knit, and construct wood and paper models. Games, drawing, singing, and dancing are important elements in the elementary program.

From the fifth grade on, extracurricular activities attain a broader scope. They are again coordinated with the actual curriculum, with a view toward increasing its effectiveness. As a result of the recent intensified polytechnization of schools, increased attention is now being given to labor training. In the country, work in machine and tractor stations, in kolkhozes and sovkhozes (in the "school hectares"), and in the cities, work in industrial enterprises, is a regular part of the program.

1. **Circles:** Every school teacher, with the help of the class officers, organizes a circle in his subject matter. It is also common for other members of the faculty, such as the school librarian and doctor, to participate in these circles. The circle meets once or twice a week after classes, and pupil participation is on a voluntary basis. As a rule, the interests of a child, not his age or class, determine the circle he joins. However, no pupil may participate in more than two circles at one time.

In many schools, the "dextrous hands" circles emphasize technology and work with various kinds of machines, for example, motorcycles, automobiles, tractors, combines. The circles for electrotechnology and radiotechnology work along similar lines. The Elizàvetinsk Secondary School in Leningrad Oblast may serve to illustrate the operation of such circles: in 1955 it

received four tractors, in addition to other farming equipment, from a local machine and tractor station, and several specialists to train the students in mechanics were assigned to the school. It is also standard practice for a kolkhoz to put a certain amount of arable land at a local school's disposal.

During the years 1955-57, the number of circles of pupils interested in technology and the natural sciences increased. During the 1954-55 academic year, the Novosibirsk Oblast, with sixteen schools, had 620 pupils participating in technology and "young naturalist" circles. In 1955-56, the number had almost doubled to 1,124. In 1956, 77,792 pupils from the first five grades were active in circles in the Irkutsk Oblast. Of these, 11,101 were members of technology circles and 10,737 of "young naturalist" circles, i.e., 28 per cent of all the pupils who were active in circles belonged to the technology and naturalist circles.

In 1955, the seven- and ten-year schools of the Russian Republic had 22,734 technology circles. More than 507,000 pupils from the fifth to the seventh grades and more than 333,000 from the eighth to the tenth grades participated in these circles. In addition, there were more than 155,000 young people in the various technology circles organized by the palaces of culture and other similar extrascholastic institutions. The work of these circles consists of the assembling and dismantling of machines and the construction of automobile and ship models. Special circles are organized under the supervision of engineers and technicians for the pupils of the senior classes.

The "young naturalist" circles cultivate and observe plants and vegetables and conduct antipest campaigns. These circles are divided into sections dealing with horticulture, floriculture, and cattle-breeding; the young pupils make modest contributions to the work of laboratories and farms. They study the principles of Dàrwinism and do research and experimentation in such fields as vegetable hybridization.

The physical-culture and sports circles are under the direction of the school's physical-culture teacher, with the school doctor

participating. They have various sections and engage in annual summer and winter competitions. In theory, the most important single benefit allegedly gained from these circles is that young people are imbued with a sense of discipline and a feeling of responsibility for the honor of the collective.

Literary, historical, and art circles are also widespread in the Soviet secondary-school system. On the average, the larger schools contain dozens of different kinds of circles, and the smaller schools two to five.

Each circle should serve a useful social purpose and should be of benefit not only to the circle's participants, but also to the entire school, the parents, and the community as a whole. During World War II, for instance, school art circles supplied musical and dramatic entertainment in hospitals. Technology circles aid in the electrification of their schools and acquire work habits on agricultural machinery. The "young naturalist" circles are active in planting and cultivating suburban garden plots.

A characteristic feature of the work of the circles are the exhibitions and artistic performances for parents, in which the pupils demonstrate the skills and knowledge they have acquired. A permanent All-Union Exhibition for Pupils and Pioneers, organized by the Ministry of Education, opened in Moscow in 1957.

2. **Clubs:** Clubs, which exist primarily in the larger schools, constitute another element of the extracurricular program directly connected with the school. The school director is the man in charge of the over-all operation of the club, but the actual work is supervised by the club's executive board which consists of teachers and pupils. A club normally meets for two or three hours after classes, three or four times a week. The work of circles and clubs is subject to scrutiny by means of popular, cultural mass activities organized by state organs. These mass activities include competitions and olympiads for the young mathematicians, astronomers, and athletes, interviews with famous men and high education officials, and evening activities and excursions.

Extrascholastic Institutions

There exist various types of extrascholastic institutions in the Soviet Union. In the R.S.F.S.R. they numbered 1,232 at the beginning of 1947. The figures for the entire country as of January 1, 1956, are given in the notes.[2]

In rural localities there are clubs for kolkhoz children, and in the cities the most important role is played by the palaces and houses of Pioneers. The latter have been organized as the basic type of extrascholastic institution, and they are composed of various sections which are listed in the notes.[3]

1. **The Pioneer Palaces:** The Pioneer's Mass Public-Activity Section organizes various activities with the large-scale participation of Pioneers and pupils. A typical house of Pioneers contains a "Lenin Room," intended to acquaint young members with the life and career of V. I. Lenin and with current political events. Some other components of this institution are: the *kabinet,* which renders aid and services to teachers and Pioneer leaders; the technology section, which studies the history and achievements of Russian and Soviet science and which also helps to equip the rooms in the house or palace of culture; the naturalist section, which, among other things, conducts the activities during such holidays as the Day of Birds, the Day of Forests, the Day of Flowers, and Garden Week.

In Leningrad, a Palace of Pioneers was opened twenty years ago in one of the most beautiful of the former imperial palaces—the Anichkov Palace on Nevsky Prospect. It contains about 300 rooms. Some 12,000 Pioneers and pupils work there under the direction of 380 teachers.

The Moscow House of Pioneers houses 170 circles, in which over 3,000 young members work under the direction of 145 teachers. It is the Lenin Room of the Moscow House of Pioneers which is one of the main centers for the organization of political work in the schools. Some of the more important components of this central extrascholastic institution are: the Maritime *Kabinet,* which engages in sailing sports; the Hunting Section, which con-

ducts an annual thirty-day summer expedition to the forests of Kalinin Oblast; the Young Geographers, who visit with pupils from schools in the Ukraine, Georgia, and the Urals. In the Moscow House of Pioneers, 725 young people participate in the Song-and-Dance Ensemble, making it the largest children's art collective in the country.

The Moscow House of Pioneers maintains contact with the schools, museums, and other institutions of Moscow. Its members make traditional excursions to Moscow's factories and meet with the workers. Another important feature of this institution are the special seminars for Pioneer activists, which have as their subjects themes such as: "Play and Toys"; "How to Build a Puppet-and-Shadow Theater"; "How to Perform Russian Dances."

In 1951, there were 1,200 houses or palaces of Pioneers, which in the larger cities are often located in the best town buildings. The one in Odessa is lodged in the palace of Count Vorontsov, the Czar's former Governor-General of the South.

2. **Children's technical stations:** Among extrascholastic children's institutions, the "children's technical stations" occupy an important place in the extracurricular program. The Central Children's Technical Station, founded in Moscow in 1926, has grown into one of the country's largest technology centers. This institution directs a network of "houses of young technicians," provides the means for children to conduct various kinds of experiments, and contains a correspondence-course section. It also publishes school aids in technology, such as *The Young Radio Technician.*

During the summer holidays, the young people associated with these stations participate in competitions for constructing the best model of an agricultural machine and often work as assistants to tractor drivers and mechanics. These young people spend a good deal of their time working with wood and metal. In commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the October Revolution, a mass competition was held for young technicians. Its theme was: "Create, Invent, Experiment!"

Among the young people of Moscow, the circle of Young Automobilists, which is attached to the Central Chauffeurs Club, enjoys special popularity. Here pupils learn to drive automobiles and become licensed chauffeurs. At the age of eighteen, they receive the right to own automobiles.

3. **Young naturalists stations:** The "young naturalists" stations, whose work is directed by the Central Station of Young Naturalists, assist the school in forming among the young "a materialist world-view, an interest in biology and in socialist agriculture." These stations are divided into sections, such as meteorology, zoology, etc. In the R.S.F.S.R., more than 250,000 Pioneers and pupils are enrolled in circles affiliated with these stations. A considerable part of the activities of these circles consists in the dissemination of agronomical information. One of their main functions is to make known in the schools the latest results of agronomical experiments. Another is to translate these results into practice on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. For example, the participants in a 1946 mass competition planted 585,000 fruit trees and berry bushes.

4. **Children's excursion-tourist stations:** Another institution worthy of note are the "children's excursion-tourist stations." The circles attached to these stations have as their goal the study of the natural resources and of the economic and cultural life of their region. Tourist excursions are made to places of historical and cultural significance. These excursions are a favorite form of relaxation for young pupils. In 1950, the pupils of the senior classes made a trip from Moscow to Stalingrad on the steamship *Joseph Stalin*; in 1951, they visited the Northern Caucasus; and in 1953, they made an excursion on the Volga-Don Canal.

5. **Children's railways:** Soviet "children's railways," which now include among their number the Little Gorki, Yerevan, Trans-Carpathian, and North Caucasian Junior Railways, are very popular, but they do not exist only for entertainment. The first "children's railway" was built in 1935 in Tbilisi, followed in 1936 by one in Dnepropetrovsk. They now exist in many cities. On these railways, the children themselves act as station-masters,

machinists, and dispatchers. Besides the pleasure they derive, the children are supposed to learn habits of punctuality, exactness, and responsibility.

6. **Children's sports schools and stadiums:** These sports schools and stadiums are designed for children and adolescents between the ages of ten and sixteen. Their membership is enormous, as witnessed by the games (*spartakiady*) of 1954 and 1955, in which some 10,000,000 pupils participated. To give the reader an idea of the variety of sports included, it might be mentioned that the Moscow Stadium has attached to it a school for figure skating.

7. **Children's libraries and children's divisions attached to libraries for adults:** The U.S.S.R. contains some 6,000 state children's libraries and children's divisions in adult libraries. Of these institutions, the Children's Hall in the Lenin State Library is best known. Library exhibitions, lectures, and talks draw several hundred young Pioneers and pupils each year. The Moscow House of Children's Books of the R.S.F.S.R. Ministry of Education is considered unique. It runs a permanent exhibition of children's literature and organizes conferences and meetings.

Children's literature is published in sixty of the languages of the U.S.S.R. The various Soviet republics publish a total of 125 children's newspapers and thirty-seven children's magazines. The State Publishing House of Children's Literature—Detgiz—was founded in 1936. Its current output of children's literature is four times that of 1940. Since 1944, all Soviet schools have observed an annual Children's Book Week.

8. **Other agencies for organizing children's leisure:** The senior pupils have their leisure time organized by upper-grade clubs attached to the house of Pioneers. In Leningrad, there are twenty such clubs, in Moscow nineteen, and in Kiev ten. During the summer, the pupils gather in the clubs at 10 A.M. for physical exercise. They then play or engage in circle activities. At 3 P.M. they go home for dinner, and at 5 P.M. they return for more activities.

These clubs play an especially important role in organizing

the children's summer holidays. The first responsibility of every club, and it may be added that this also applies to the houses and palaces of culture, is to participate actively in the work of the suburban summer camps and to conduct summer excursions. Every year more than 2,500,000 children spend their holidays at these suburban Pioneer summer camps. These camps are organized by the trade unions and are the trade unions' major responsibility in the field of child welfare. In addition, the trade unions organize various holidays for children, such as that of the New Year's Fir Tree, and set up and run puppet theaters and children's movie theaters. They assign personnel for the operation of these theaters and distribute tickets in the schools and houses and palaces of Pioneers.

In addition to the above-mentioned extrascholastic institutions, there is the Children's Society of the DOSAAF (Voluntary Society for Cooperation with the Army, Air Force, and Navy), which organizes ship- and aviation-model construction and water sports on a major scale. Then, in large industrial cities such as Moscow and Leningrad, there are the house management circles, which work in cooperation with parents' organizations. These circles provide instruction in home economics and give assignments which, in fact, involve domestic chores.

The majority of all these extrascholastic children's institutions are run directly by the ministries of education of the Union republics and are financed by the state. Even those which are supported by the trade unions or other public organizations are controlled and directed by the ministries of education.[4]

Evaluation of Extracurricular Activities

It would be a mistake to accept the favorable impressions possibly conveyed by the above descriptions of the great multiplicity of institutions at face value. There are many shortcomings in the work of these groups.

For example, there are frequent complaints that many of the clubs do not contain subject-matter circles, and that in general

the level of work in children's institutions does not meet minimal standards. Passes to summer camps are too often given in reward for the services of parents, and not of the children, so that frequently there are children in the camps who do not deserve to be there.[5] In the houses and palaces of Pioneers, the range of children allowed to participate is very narrow; only those who are good pupils and have excellent school conduct records are accepted.[6]

The selection and training of summer-camp supervisors and teachers frequently is considered a matter of secondary importance by Komsomol and trade-union organizations, and consequently is carried through hurriedly as a formality.[7] Sometimes the selection of summer-camp cadres is not given any attention at all, and in the month of July one can still find camps without staffs. Another problem is a critical lack of doctors for summer camps.[8] Summer-camp personnel is often recruited from among students in institutions of higher learning who have no experience in working with children.[9]

In 1954, due to poor staffing, things went badly in the Kiev Pioneer Camp; the children were frankly bored. In other places, under the pretext of leaving things to the children's initiative, activities were left to run their own course without any organization.[10] In 1955, in the summer camp of the Irkutsk Trade-Union Oblast Committee, not only were the children bored, they were absolutely neglected: the camp was without furniture or equipment, there were no movies, excursions, or musical instruments. Most important, there were no teachers. This camp was not an exception, judging by the complaints in Soviet newspapers.

There are reports of unsanitary conditions in the camps. Such was the case in 1956 in a Georgian camp of the Central Trade-Union Committee of Educational Workers.[11] In 1955, the editorial board of *Sovetskaya Latviya* complained of the monotonous menu in the dining rooms of Latvian summer camps, of poor planning in cultural work, and of a generally indifferent attitude toward the young campers.[12] Frequently camp activities are

planned on the basis of banal, commonplace formulas and are incapable of attracting or interesting the campers.[13]

Another serious shortcoming of extracurricular activities is in the area of summer work done by pupils on collective farms. Certain school directors, in an effort to maximize the work-day units earned by their pupils, show an utter lack of interest in providing these pupils with adequate rest.[14] In Stavropol, during their holidays, pupils of the senior classes work on appointed plots in kolkhozes. Under conditions of highly mechanized agriculture, one or two hectares per pupil would be a feasible assignment. What has occurred is a strong tendency to increase this norm, and along with it the number of work days a pupil earns. The Stavropol District Party Committee has warned school directors and collective farm chairmen against this practice as detrimental to the pupils' interests.[15]

Another shortcoming reported in Soviet educational journals is that the ministries of education do not sufficiently take into account the experience and desires of schools and often provide them with inadequate funds. The Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. has called upon the organs of public education to aid in the expansion of extracurricular and extrascholastic activities. The successful achievement of this goal will depend upon the knowledge and initiative of the people entrusted with the task.[16]

The cited examples are taken mainly from the experiences in extracurricular activities in the larger cities of European Russia. The situation in the minority republics and oblasts is much worse. The absence of children's cultural institutions (clubs, technical stations, etc.), and an insufficiency of actual school space where children might carry on extracurricular activities, seriously hampers the program.

In general, the Soviet government, engaged in an intensive buildup of heavy and military industry, is too little concerned with expanding the network of extrascholastic educational institutions.

9. Recent Changes in the Training of Soviet Secondary-School Teachers[1]

by NORTON DODGE

Soviet leaders have long appreciated the crucial role of the teacher in transforming Czarist Russia into the modern Communist state. By the time of Stalin's death, considerable success had been achieved in increasing the number and improving the quality of teachers and in shaping their political beliefs. Although the basic aims of teacher training have remained much the same during the past six years, teacher-training policies, like many other aspects of the Soviet system, have undergone important changes, reflecting new conditions and altered needs.

Three significant factors have influenced the evolution of teacher training during this period of transition. First, an overall abundance of teachers, reflected in a 1955-56 student-teacher ratio of seventeen to one, resulted from the wartime reduction in the birth rate. This was particularly true for teachers of grades one through four, where enrollment declined almost one-third between 1950-51 and 1955-56, while the class size remained at thirty-five pupils per class.[2] Second, a shortage of qualified teachers in certain subjects developed in grades eight through ten as complete ten-year schools became more widely accessible to students throughout all parts of the Soviet Union and enrollment in the upper grades expanded rapidly.[3] In 1955-56, for example, no more than two-thirds of the teachers for grades eight through ten had graduated from higher educational

institutions.[4] Third, in recent years the great majority of the growing number of secondary-school graduates has been compelled to enter industry rather than attend higher educational institutions because of the lack of need in some fields and the lack of facilities in others, and it has become increasingly clear that these ten-year-school graduates were ill-prepared for practical work. As a result, the excessively academic character of the secondary-school curriculum has been moderated by the introduction of more down-to-earth methods of teaching theoretical concepts through application in the factory or field and through the addition of purely vocational courses in agriculture and in industrial techniques.[5] It is hoped that this revival of polytechnical education of secondary-school students will develop the skills and attitudes necessary for a successful transition to industrial work.[6]

The combined effect of these three factors upon teacher training has been to spur the preparation of teachers for the upper grades, to encourage a lengthening and broadening of the teacher-training programs, and to stimulate the adaptation of teacher training to the more practical needs of polytechnical education. In pursuing these aims, two different approaches have been employed by Soviet educational planners. The first, which involved changes in teacher-training institutions, will be discussed only briefly. The second, which involved changes in the length and content of teacher-training programs, is the main subject of this essay and will be discussed in greater detail.

Changes in School Structure

During the Stalin era, teachers of grades five through ten of the Soviet seven- and ten-year schools were prepared in three types of institutions, following their completion of the ten-year school: (1) teachers' institutes (normal schools), which provided two years of training for teachers of grades five through seven; (2) pedagogical institutes (teachers' colleges), which provided four years of training for teachers of grades eight

through ten; and (3) universities, which provided five years of specialized professional training. A considerable number of university graduates in nonscience fields became teachers in grades eight through ten, but few science graduates entered secondary-school teaching.[7] Until 1956, university students did not, as a rule, receive training in pedagogy and teaching methods as was the case with teachers'-institute and pedagogical-institute students.

When the goal of establishing universal, ten-year school education was announced by the Party in 1952, it was decided to meet the rapidly expanding need for teachers of grades eight through ten by converting many of the two-year teachers' institutes into four-year pedagogical institutes providing facilities for more thorough training to a larger number of students. As a result, the number of teachers' institutes dwindled, from 196 in 1946 to two in 1957, while the number of pedagogical institutes increased from 120 to 204.[8]

By 1955, the process of closing some teachers' institutes and converting others into pedagogical institutes had progressed sufficiently to permit the government to announce that beginning with the 1955-56 school year all teachers for grades five through ten would be recruited only from among those who had completed a full four- or five-year training program.[9] This announcement led to a sharp increase in enrollment in the extension-correspondence programs of the pedagogical institutes as teachers lacking proper qualifications hastened to raise their qualifications before the announced deadline. In this fashion, not only the level of training of new teachers, but also that of teachers already in service was raised.

At the same time, the universities were required to assign at least 80 per cent of the graduates in the fields of philology, history, geography, and biology to teaching positions in secondary schools. However, because of the pressing need in industry and research, only 60 per cent of physics, mathematics, and chemistry graduates were to be so assigned.[10] If this measure had been effectively carried out, the role of the university as a supplier of secondary-school teachers would have been increased signifi-

cantly, particularly in the sciences. But at best, the universities could supply only about one-eighth of the number of teachers graduated by the pedagogical institutes, because of the smaller regular enrollment in the universities in comparison with the pedagogical institutes and the smaller proportion of university graduates assigned to teaching.[11] Therefore, the qualitative effect of the new regulations on the composition of the teaching force would be slight, even if they were applied in their entirety.

Curricular Changes

The elimination of teachers' institutes, the expansion of the pedagogical institutes, and the somewhat increased importance of the universities as suppliers of secondary-school teachers have unquestionably raised the level of training of secondary-school teachers. Nevertheless, recent changes in the curricula of the pedagogical institutes and universities are equally important in their impact on the character and quality of training. The most significant of these changes was a broadening and lengthening of pedagogical-institute curricula to include combined specialties and more vocationally oriented courses in the science faculties and the addition of education courses to university curricula designed for training teachers.

Fortunately, the materials necessary to study these curricular changes are now available. During a visit to the Soviet Union in 1955, the writer made copies of curricula appearing in the publication *Uchebnye plany pedagogicheskikh institutov,* which contains the basic collection of four-year study programs approved by the Ministry of Higher Education of the U.S.S.R. for the pedagogical institutes of the Ministry of Education of the R.S.F.S.R. This set of four-year programs may be compared with a similar set of five-year programs obtained by the U.S. Office of Education delegation during a visit to the Soviet Union in the spring of 1958. These two sets of programs also permit interesting comparisons with university curricula obtained by the writer and the delegation. Some of these university curricula are "indi-

vidual" in character and vary slightly from the curricula of other universities, but the differences are not sufficiently great to limit the general significance of the comparisons made in this essay.

1. **Fields of Specialization:** The lengthening of the pedagogical-institute study program from four to five years has had a significant effect upon the number of subject-matter areas in which students are prepared to teach. A comparison of the subjects or subject groups in which students could specialize under the old four-year and the new five-year pedagogical-institute programs reveals a new emphasis on preparation in several related fields. In the past, Soviet teacher training has been highly specialized, but as Table I shows, it is no longer possible to concentrate on individual subjects, such as mathematics, geography, and history. These subjects have been completely eliminated as separate fields of study and are now combined with drafting, biology, and Russian language and literature. In addition, as a result of the present "practical" emphasis, training in "the fundamentals of production" and "the fundamentals of agriculture" has been added to training in physics, and to biology and chemistry. Therefore, all teachers are now prepared to teach at least two and possibly three subjects.

TABLE I

SPECIALTIES BY SUBJECT GROUP (EXCLUDING PHYSICAL EDUCATION) IN FOUR- AND FIVE-YEAR PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTE PROGRAMS

Four-Year Program	Five-Year Program
1. Mathematics	1. Mathematics and Drafting
2. Mathematics and Physics	2. Mathematics and Physics
3. Physics and Astronomy	3. Physics and the Fundamentals of Production
4. Biology and Chemistry	4. Biology, Chemistry, and the Fundamentals of Agriculture
5. Geography	5. Geography and Biology
6. English, French, or German	6. Foreign Languages (two)
7. Russian Language and Literature	7. Russian Language, Literature, and one Foreign Language
8. History	8. Russian Language, Literature, and History

The government expects to derive a number of benefits from the introduction of these broader profiles. The extreme specialization which formerly characterized teacher training made it difficult to establish small schools in rural areas which could provide training through grades seven or ten, since there might be insufficient work to occupy a narrowly specialized teacher fully. A teacher trained in a broad profile, on the other hand, can be assigned to teach several subjects at such a school. Furthermore, if teachers are equipped to teach several subjects, it will be much easier for the government to assign teachers to appropriate positions, and errors in planning the proportion of teachers trained in various specialties can be reduced.[12] Whether this greater flexibility will be gained at the expense of thoroughness in training in the combined subjects will be discussed subsequently.

2. **Changes in Length of Program:** The lengthening of pedagogical-institute training from four to five years in 1956 meant an increase of 500 to 1,000 hours in the total number of hours required in the various programs. A comparison of hours required by representative four- and five-year pedagogical-institute and university programs is shown in Table II, below. These requirements are broken down into hours devoted to lectures, laboratory work, and other activities such as seminars, exercises, and practical work, so that the category in which the principal changes occurred may be clearly seen.

As the examples compared in Table II indicate, the new five-year pedagogical-institute programs require substantially more hours than the four-year pedagogical-institute programs and, perhaps surprisingly, more hours than three of the five-year university programs. The combined Russian language, literature, and history curriculum, for example, is particularly demanding. While the total hours required by the foreign language curriculum have increased to over 4,800, the lecture hours required in this program have been somewhat reduced. Only the physics and the fundamentals of production program, where comparison is made with a purely academic university curriculum, requires fewer hours than the five and one-half year university curriculum. On the other hand, a five-year university curriculum, obtained

TABLE II

A Comparison of Hours Required in Selected Pedagogical Institute and University Programs

Specialized Field and Curricula	Hours				
	Index	Total	Lecture	Laboratory	Other
Mathematics[a]					
Pedagogical Institute, 1955, 4 yrs.	100	3,816	1,954	309	1,553
Pedagogical Institute, 1957, 5 yrs.	112	4,290	2,050	518	1,722
University, 1957, 5 yrs.	102	3,878	2,198	68	1,612
Physics[b]					
Pedagogical Institute, 1955, 4 yrs.	100	3,774	1,857	742	1,175
Pedagogical Institute, 1957, 5 yrs.	121	4,530	1,904	1,198	1,428
University, 1957, 5½ yrs.[c]	137	5,144[d]	2,110	1,686	1,378
Russian Language, Literature, and History[e]					
Pedagogical Institute, 1955, 4 yrs.	100	3,413	2,067	—	1,346
Pedagogical Institute, 1957, 5 yrs.	130	4,434	2,538	—	1,896
University, 1957, 5 yrs.	115	3,978	1,988	16	1,974
Foreign Languages[f]					
Pedagogical Institute, 1955, 4 yrs.	100	3,874	1,049	—	2,825
Pedagogical Institute, 1957, 5 yrs.	125	4,824	948	—	3,876
University, 1957, 5 yrs.	112	4,350	1,464	16	2,870

[a] The five-year pedagogical-institute program equips the student to teach mathematics and drafting, one of the combined specialties.

[b] The five-year pedagogical-institute program equips the student to teach physics and the fundamentals of production, one of the combined specialties.

[c] The five and one-half year university program is an academic curriculum and, unlike the other programs compared here, is not designed to train secondary-school teachers.

[d] The Soviet curriculum shows a total of 5,144 required hours, or thirty less than the sum of the subtotals of columns 3, 4, and 5. The cause of this discrepancy cannot be determined.

[e] Only the five-year pedagogical-institute curriculum includes history as a part of the combined specialty. The other two programs include only Russian language and literature.

[f] The five-year pedagogical-institute program equips the student to teach two languages; the other two programs only one, although the university program includes a second language.

by the author during his visit to the Soviet Union in 1955, required only 4,290 hours, some 200 hours less than is required by the present five-year pedagogical-institute program.

When examining these figures it should be kept in mind that an American teachers-college or university program normally requires only 2,000 to 2,200 hours of classroom, laboratory, or other work for a bachelor's degree.

3. **Changes in the Weekly Course Load:** The heavy burden of lectures, laboratory, and other required course work has been a perennial source of complaint among both students and educators. One of the reasons for increasing the length of the pedagogical-institute course from four to five years was the desire to reduce the weekly work load. Previous efforts to reduce the load —in 1951 and 1954—had little positive effect, but the 1956 revision, by extending the term of study by one year, offered greater promise. However, the substantial increase in total hours required largely negated the beneficial effect which might have been achieved by spreading the classroom work of the four-year program over nine rather than eight semesters. The final, or tenth, semester of the five-year program is normally devoted to practice teaching, industrial practice (in most curricula), and state examinations rather than classroom work, while at the university, the final semester is devoted to the preparation and defense of a diploma project or thesis and to state examinations.

A comparison of the weekly course load of the four- and five-year pedagogical-institute program with the university programs in four representative fields of study is shown in Table III, below.

Although the 1956 reform reduced the weekly class load slightly in three of the four fields of study cited, the required weekly class load of the pedagogical institutes remained somewhat heavier than that of the universities. Thus, the stretching out of the pedagogical-institute program failed to free the student from the back-breaking weekly round of lectures, labs, and other required work. By European or American university standards, even the lightest of these programs would be considered insufferably heavy.

TABLE III

A Comparison of the Weekly Course Load of the Four- and Five-Year Pedagogical Institute and University Programs

Semester	Hours Per Week											
	Mathematics			Physics			Language, Literature, and History[a]			Foreign Languages		
	Pedagogical Institute		University[b]	Pedagogical Institute		University[c]	Pedagogical Institute		University[d]	Pedagogical Institute		University[e]
	1955	1957	1957	1955	1957	1957	1955	1957	1957	1955	1957	1957
1st	36	34	31	36	32	36	33	32	32	36	34	32
2nd	36	33	31	36	33	36	32	32	32	36	34	31
3rd	36	31	32	36	32	32	35	34	32	36	34	32
4th	36	32	30	36	32	32	32	34	31	36	34	32
5th	30	32	26	30	32	32	30	32	31	30	32	31
6th	30	32	27	30	32	32	30	32	26	30	32	32
7th	30	26	26	26	30	20	24	30	24	30	32	26
8th	26	24	21	22	30	31	16	24	18	30	30	24
9th	—	24	11	—	24	29	—	20	14	—	30	24
10th	—	—	2	—	—	28	—	—	—	—	—	—

[a] The 1955 pedagogical-institute program and the 1957 university program do not include history as part of the specialty.
[b] University programs designed to train secondary-school teachers.
[c] A purely academic university program, five and one-half years in length.
[d] *See* note [a].
[e] *See* note [a].

An Analysis of Changes in Curricula

The lengthened pedagogical-institute program also has permitted the introduction of courses of a vocational or polytechnical character designed to prepare the student to utilize polytechnical methods in the teaching of science courses and to prepare him to teach vocational subjects recently added to the secondary-school curriculum. The effect of the introduction of these and other new courses upon the pedagogical-institute curriculum is shown in Tables IV–VII, which break down representative four- and five-year curricula at pedagogical institutes and universities into various course groups.

In order to aid the reader in understanding the contents of the various course groups, a brief explanation of the courses included follows:

Political courses include the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism (now the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at pedagogical institutes), political economy, dialectical and historical materialism, and the history of philosophy (at some universities). These courses are found in every curriculum and account for 10 to 14 per cent of the hours required by pedagogical-institute programs and 10 to 19 per cent of the university programs cited.

The designations of several of the political courses suggest that they might properly be included as subject-matter courses. However, courses in the political category are neither objective nor scholarly and serve primarily as a vehicle for indoctrination in Marxism and in Party dogma. In the combined nonscience fields such as Russian language, literature, and history, indoctrination is by no means limited to courses in the political category, but pervades the specialized subject-matter courses as well.[13]

General courses include the foreign language and physical education and sports courses which are found in every program. In some curricula, a course in logic is also included in this category. These courses account for only a small number of hours in all programs.

Specialty courses include all required courses in a program's special field or combined fields, plus required courses in closely related fields, such as a chemistry course in the physics program or a literature course in a language program, and all elective courses not included in other course groups. Together, these courses usually account for from one-half to three-fourths of the hours required by a pedagogical-institute or university program.

Vocational or polytechnically oriented courses in the four- and five-year pedagogical-institute program include courses in drafting. The five-year science programs of the pedagogical institutes require several additional courses. The physics and the fundamentals of production program, for example, requires courses in machine technology, which provides practical training in auto-tractor technology; the technology of metals and materials, which includes practical training in school workshops; technical mechanics; electro-technology; and radio technology.

In addition to these courses, which are a part of the regular academic curriculum, each student is required to spend a total of seven weeks working in a repair workshop or repair and technical station (which has largely replaced the MTS), and in a factory or electric power station. The biology, chemistry, and the fundamentals of agriculture program, on the other hand, requires courses in the fundamentals of agriculture, in the fundamentals of chemical technology, and in the mechanization of agriculture, as well as ten weeks of summer work experience in chemical technology and agriculture. In these two programs, vocationally oriented courses account for 20 and 10.4 per cent respectively of the required hours. It should be clearly understood that the courses, included in the vocational category, are not in themselves vocational but are so classified here because they equip the teacher to teach courses of a vocational character in the secondary school.

At the university level, the only vocational courses required in the physics program are drafting and educational shop. The latter is also required in the chemistry program. These courses represent an insignificant percentage of the programs in which they occur. No vocational courses of any kind are required in the nonscience programs of either the pedagogical institutes or universities.

Education courses at pedagogical institutes include psychology, pedagogy, history of pedagogy, a methods course in the student's major field or fields, school hygiene, educational films, pedagogic practice in extracurricular activity, and special training. At the university, three education courses are normally offered: psychology, pedagogy, and a methods course.

In addition to regular course work in education, pedagogical-institute students are now required to do sixteen weeks of practice teaching in the course of their training and to work three weeks at a Pioneer camp during the summer following their third year. The new university programs for the preparation of secondary-school teachers also include three weeks of training at a Pioneer camp and about two months of practice teaching. It is reported

that all university students take education courses either as required or elective courses, but the educational training of the pedagogical-institute graduate is more comprehensive and thorough and may well give him an advantage over his university counterpart at the school desk.

Having made this explanation of the courses included under each heading, we may now compare the four- and five-year pedagogical-institute and five-year university curricula for several important fields of specialization.

TABLE IV

MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS BROKEN DOWN BY COURSE GROUPS
(in hours and percentages)

Course Groups	Pedagogical Institute				University	
	1955		1957[a]		1957	
	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%
Political	504	13.2	504	11.7	504	13.0
General	260	6.8	280	6.5	340	8.8
Education[b]	513	13.4	590	13.8	134	3.5
Mathematics	1,911	50.1	2,080	48.5	2,214	57.0
Physics and other sciences	564	14.8	540	12.6	686	17.7
Vocational	64	1.7	296	6.9	—	—
Total	3,816	100.0	4,290	100.0	3,878	100.0

[a] The 1957 pedagogical-institute program trains a student to teach drafting as well as mathematics.

[b] Practice teaching is not included.

1. **Mathematics:** Comparison of the data presented in Table IV shows that significant increases in the education and vocational course requirements of the four-year pedagogical-institute program were made in the five-year mathematics and drafting program. Education courses increased from 513 to 590 hours, and vocational courses increased almost five-fold, from 64 to 296 hours, through the expansion of a 64-hour course in drafting to a 216-hour course in projective and technical drafting and

teaching methods, and through the addition of a new 80-hour course in the fundamentals of machine-tool operation. The combined load of required and elective physics and mathematics courses, on the other hand, increased by only 146 hours, or less than 6 per cent, while the total course load of the program increased by more than 12 per cent. Consequently, the share of courses in the major field declined from approximately 65 per cent of the four-year program to 61 per cent of the five-year program.

The main features which distinguish the university program from the lengthened pedagogical-institute program are a more thorough training in a foreign language, fewer education courses, the absence of vocational courses, and a somewhat heavier load of specialized subject-matter courses offered in the university curriculum. While there is considerable overlapping of mathematics and science courses offered in the two programs, the university curriculum requires more advanced courses and offers greater freedom of choice. The pedagogical-institute curriculum, on the other hand, offers only two or three advanced elective courses. Furthermore, the university graduate must prepare and defend a diploma project which in content and scope is roughly equivalent to an American master's thesis. Although the university curriculum unquestionably provides better training in specialized subject matter, nevertheless the graduate of the pedagogical institute receives a very thorough grounding in his special field or fields of study.

2. **Physics:** The five-year pedagogical-institute program in physics and the fundamentals of production differs from the four-year program in physics and astronomy in much the same way as the five-year mathematics curriculum differs from the four-year curriculum. Table V shows that significant increases were made in the number of hours devoted to education and vocational courses. The hours devoted to courses of a vocational character increased from only 10 per cent of the four-year program to 20 per cent of the new, lengthened program, with field work or practical work required in addition. Indeed, this new vocational

emphasis is reflected in the title given the new specialization—physics and the fundamentals of production. The number of hours devoted to mathematics and physics courses was increased only slightly, and the percentage of total time devoted to these subjects declined from 54.6 to 46.2 per cent. Therefore, specialized training in mathematics and physics was largely unchanged by the lengthening of the pedagogical-institute program, though it occupies a smaller proportion of the student's time in the longer program.

TABLE V

PHYSICS PROGRAMS BROKEN DOWN BY COURSE GROUPS
(in hours and percentages)

Course Groups	Pedagogical Institute				University	
	1955[a]		1957[b]		1957	
	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%
Political	504	13.3	504	11.1	504	9.8
General	260	6.9	280	6.2	406	7.9
Education[c]	562	14.9	748	16.5	—	—
Mathematics	572	15.2	568	12.5	906	17.6
Physics and other sciences	1,488	39.4	1,524	33.7	3,192	62.1
Vocational	388	10.3	906	20.0	136	2.6
Total	3,744	100.0	4,530	100.0	5,144	100.0

[a] The 1955 pedagogical-institute program trained a student to teach astronomy as well as physics.

[b] The 1957 pedagogical-institute program trains a student to teach the fundamentals of industry as well as physics.

[c] Practice teaching is not included.

Unlike the other university curricula cited in this essay, the university physics curriculum in Table V was designed to train professional physicists rather than secondary-school teachers. It is one of the most demanding and rigorous of university programs. Furthermore, it is a half-year longer than the usual five-year university program. As a result, even the lengthened pedagogical-institute curriculum fails to approach the number of hours re-

quired by the university course. In the university program, work in mathematics and physics alone (including one chemistry course of 100 hours) requires only 10 per cent fewer hours than the entire five-year pedagogical-institute program. The university curriculum also includes many more advanced and specialized courses and requires the completion of a diploma project as well.[14]

3. **Other Science Programs:** A comparison of the four- and five-year pedagogical and university programs in the fields of mathematics and physics; biology, chemistry, and the fundamentals of agriculture; and geography and biology shows results comparable to those already revealed in previous comparisons. In every instance, the new five-year program of the pedagogical institute includes substantially more hours of education and practical courses and slightly more hours of basic science and mathematics courses. A direct comparison of these programs with university curricula is difficult, since there is no university counterpart to the combined specialties offered by the five-year pedagogical-institute programs. It is clear, nevertheless, that the pedagogical-institute programs cannot cover two or more specialized fields as thoroughly as the university curricula cover a single field.

4. **Foreign Languages:** In the nonscience fields, the three programs for foreign-language teachers shown in Table VI differ in much the same way as the mathematics, physics, and other science programs. The five-year pedagogical-institute curriculum increased the hours devoted to education courses and added 800 hours of training in a second foreign language to the 2,824 hours devoted to the first. The four-year pedagogical-institute curriculum, on the other hand, provided 2,823 hours of training in a single language. Unlike the science curricula, no vocational or polytechnically oriented courses were offered in either the four- or five-year foreign-language programs of the pedagogical institute.

The five-year university curriculum for foreign-language teachers provides more thorough training in linguistics and in the student's major language. In addition, the student must complete and defend a diploma project. However, only 248 hours are de-

voted to training in a second language. The hours devoted to education courses in the university program are also substantially less than in the five-year pedagogical-institute program. A comparison of the allocation of hours in the two programs suggests that the graduate of the five-year pedagogical institute should have about as thorough a practical training in his first language as a university graduate and a better training in his second language. However, his linguistic and theoretical training will be inferior.

TABLE VI

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE PROGRAMS BROKEN DOWN BY COURSE GROUPS
(in hours and percentages)

Course Groups	Pedagogical Institute				University	
	1955		1957		1957	
	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%
Political	504	13.0	504	10.5	646	14.9
General	130	3.3	140	2.9	270	8.2
Education[a]	417	10.8	556	11.5	136	3.1
Languages, linguistics, and related subjects	2,823	72.9	3,624	75.1	3,298	75.8
Total	3,874	100.0	4,824	100.0	4,350	100.0

[a] Practice teaching is not included.

5. **Russian language, literature, and history:** The combination of the Russian language and literature and the history specializations of the four-year pedagogical-institute program into a single five-year specialization provides an interesting comparison with the two corresponding four-year programs of the pedagogical institute and with the two five-year programs of the university. Table VII shows that despite the lengthening of the pedagogical-institute program from four to five years, the number of hours devoted to training in Russian language and literature and to training in history has been reduced from the number required by the two four-year programs combined. The number

of hours devoted to Russian language and literature have been cut approximately 12 per cent, while the number devoted to history has been reduced by approximately 21 per cent. Thus, the broadening of the profile of the pedagogical-institute program to include both the Russian language and literature and the history specializations has tended to weaken the subject-matter content of the training in each of these two fields. As a result, the longer five-year program of the pedagogical institute has failed, in this instance, to approximate more closely the level of university training in the two areas of specialization. A similar reduction in the number of hours required for each specialized field of study may be found in the combined Russian language, literature, and one foreign-language specialization.

TABLE VII

RUSSIAN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND HISTORY PROGRAMS BROKEN DOWN BY COURSE GROUPS
(in hours and percentages)

Course Groups	Pedagogical Institute						University			
	1955				1957		1957			
	Russian Language and Literature		History		Russian Language, Literature, and History		History		Slavic Languages and Literature	
	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%
Political	504	14.8	572	16.0	504	11.4	646	18.7	646	16.2
General	330	9.7	596	15.5	350	7.9	636	18.4	414	10.3
Education[a]	592	17.3	491	13.4	514	13.4	210	6.1	172	4.3
Russian Language and Literature	1,987	58.2	208	7.2	1,748	39.4	—	0.0	2,714	68.3
History	—	—	1,715	47.9	1,238	27.9	1,968	56.8	36	0.9
Total	3,413	100.0	3,582	100.0	4,434	100.0	3,460	100.0	3,978	100.0

[a] Practice teaching is not included.

Conclusions

The survey of changes in pedagogical-institute programs reveals a fairly clear-cut pattern common to all curricula. The most significant change common to all occurred in the share of the program devoted to education courses. The number of re-

quired hours in these courses was increased by about one-third in every program. Also of major importance was the sharp increase in courses of a vocational character required in the science programs.

The number of hours devoted to specialized subject-matter training increased slightly in most programs, frequently through the addition of one or more advanced elective courses. Only in the newly combined programs, where increased hours were spread more thinly over two or three fields of specialization, was there a reduction in the number of hours devoted to subject-matter training in each of the fields. A thorough evaluation of the qualitative effect of these quantitative changes would require a detailed analysis of materials such as syllabi, textbooks, and examinations, not to mention first-hand observation. But it may be assumed that the broadening of several profiles was achieved at the expense of depth in the specialized fields included in the newly combined programs.

A comparison of the new five-year pedagogical-institute programs with university programs for the training of secondary-school teachers reveals fundamental differences in the character of the preparation provided by these two types of educational institutions.[15] University training, for example, is more highly specialized, and the student is required to do some independent research. However, the pedagogical-institute and university programs have become increasingly similar. On the one hand, the university now provides training in pedagogy and teaching methods for all students preparing to teach, and, on the other hand, the time devoted by the pedagogical institute to preparation in a special field has been lengthened slightly in all but the newly combined programs, such as Russian language, literature, and history. Furthermore, the quality of the preparation has been modestly improved through the addition of elective courses at the advanced level. Nevertheless, despite the somewhat greater similarity which exists between the pedagogical-institute and university programs, a sizeable gap still remains between the levels of pedagogical-institute and university training.

An American reader can better appreciate the extent of the

difference between the two levels of training if we transpose the levels to a more familiar frame of reference. Although a definitive evaluation of the quality of Soviet training in all fields has not been made, students of Soviet education generally agree that it is possible to equate the level of subject-matter training of a Soviet pedagogical-institute graduate who has specialized in a science field with that of an American college graduate who has majored in the same field. On the other hand, the training of a Soviet university graduate who has specialized in a science field is considered roughly comparable to that of an American graduate student who has completed a year of graduate training in the same field. Thus, the preparation received by the university graduate in his special field is superior to that of the pedagogical-institute graduate by at least a year's specialized work.[16]

There is much less agreement regarding the quality of training in nonscience fields. Nevertheless, despite some disagreement regarding the absolute quality of the training provided, specialists would generally agree that the difference between the quality of pedagogical-institute and university teacher-training in nonscience fields is probably much the same as in the science fields. Therefore, approximately a year's specialized work separates the quality of pedagogical-institute preparation from that of the university in both the science and nonscience fields.

The comparison of the quality of Soviet and American training made above also reveals the Soviets' great emphasis upon preparation in subject matter, not only at the university, but also at the pedagogical-institute level. With the elimination of teachers' institutes and the lengthening of the pedagogical-institute programs, all Soviet secondary-school teachers now receive preparation in their special fields of study, even in the newly combined specialties, which is more thorough than that of most teachers trained in the United States today. This observation is particularly true of teachers trained in the sciences. Indeed, many of our physics, chemistry, and biology teachers have completed only one or two college courses in the subjects they teach.[17] Furthermore, because of the lengthening of the pedagogical-

institute program from four to five years, the inclusion of courses of a vocational nature in science programs has been achieved without reducing the number of hours devoted to specialized subject-matter courses.

In addition to extensive preparation in their specialized field or fields, teachers trained in pedagogical institutes receive extensive preparation in pedagogy and teaching methods, coupled with a varied practice-teaching experience. Now even the university programs for the training of secondary-school teachers include courses in pedagogy and teaching methods. Moreover, all teachers, whether trained in pedagogical institutes or universities, receive thorough and extensive political indoctrination designed to make them effective representatives of the Party point of view in the communities to which they are assigned.

The comprehensive and variegated preparation that a Soviet teacher receives is made possible by the length and rigor of the present programs. Both the lengthening of pedagogical-institute training and the elimination of teachers' institutes provide evidence of the continuing awareness of Soviet educational planners that the over-all effectiveness of an educational system can be improved significantly by improving the teaching at the secondary level. Whether this simple truth will be obscured in the upheavals in Soviet education presaged by Khrushchev's proposals for a reorganization of secondary and higher education cannot be foreseen.[18]

10. Moscow University: The Summit of Soviet Higher Education

by BURTON RUBIN

In July and August of 1956, the Soviet press conducted a campaign for the improvement of the material facilities of Soviet education. Extraordinary facts came to light. For example, a two-story school building in the village of Lermontovo, Penza Province, had been under construction for ten years and was still not finished;[1] laboratories at the Leningrad M. I. Kalinin Polytechnical Institute were equipped with machinery decades behind the modern level of technology[2]—in general, a picture of widespread failure on the part of enterprise heads and Party and government agencies to meet the material needs of Soviet schools. Perhaps the most vivid contribution to this campaign was made by a letter to the editor of *Pravda,* written by M. Nyazov, the Director of the Central Asian Polytechnical Institute. He provided a catalogue of the steady deterioration of his Institute under the impact of a five-fold increase in enrollment (from 1,000 to 5,000) since it was founded in 1934. ". . . this growth has occurred with no substantial improvement in the Institute's material and technical resources. In 1934, there were fifteen square meters of study space per student; in 1941, ten; and today there are not more than three. . . . There are not enough lecture halls. . . . Two-thirds of the scientific-pedagogical personnel are not even provided with a place to work. The Institute's dormitories are crowded and many of the public rooms have been converted to living space."[3]

In reading the description which follows, the condition of the students and faculty at such places as the Central Asian Polytechnical Institute should be kept in mind. For this essay describes not only the summits of Soviet education—university education—but the topmost heights of these summits. The existence of the university in the Soviet Union is in itself a unique factor in the enormously specialized organization of Soviet higher education. The arresting characteristic of Soviet higher education is the sovereignty of the specialized institute, some 700-odd of which train specialists for the various Soviet social services and branches of the economy. Weighed in the balance of the entire higher educational enterprise, thirty-nine universities[4] with approximately one-fifteenth of the total enrollment make up a pitifully small segment, but it is in them alone that education in the pure sciences and humanities survives. On the whole, they differ from the institutes in the standards as well as the character of the education they offer. Evidence of this is the reluctance of university students to accept assignments as secondary-school teachers after graduation. The attitude of a Soviet university graduate is that if he must teach in a secondary school he might just as well have studied at the much less demanding pedagogical institutes.[5] In other words, one of the important things about Soviet universities is that they produce the Soviet Union's intellectual elite and that this is how university graduates, particularly those attending Moscow University, regard themselves.

By far the best known Soviet institution of higher learning, the Kremlin's most highly-publicized cultural showpiece, and in its own eyes the proudest cultural achievement of the Soviet period, Moscow University is a huge complex of recently completed buildings looking down upon the city of Moscow from the eminence of Lenin Hills. It is Russia's oldest university,[6] having grown from its original two-story building on Red Square, which at one time had housed the Government Apothecary (the present site of the Historical Museum), into the impressive institution it is today.

The minute one begins to look into the early history of

Moscow University one runs into an Orwellian fact of modern Soviet life. According to several hundred years of scholarly tradition, assorted documents, and the testimony of contemporaries, Moscow University was founded on January 12, 1755, by Count I. I. Shuvalov, an aristocratic patron of enlightenment and court favorite of the Empress Elizaveta Petrovna.[7] Soviet historians find this disagreeable, and have recently begun to tell one another that the actual founder of Moscow University was Mikhail V. Lomonosov.

Lomonosov was very remarkable indeed, a Russian version of the Renaissance Man, who combined a great talent for poetry and philology with important discoveries in electricity, meteorology, optics, astronomy, and geology. But his only achievement with regard to Moscow University was having worked out the plans for its curriculum and organization, as Shuvalov had employed him to do. One of the fascinating sidelights on this intellectual titan is that he was of peasant origin, the son of a White Sea fisherman. This fact has persuaded the official Soviet historians that it was he, and not the court aristocrat Shuvalov, who was responsible for a giant step forward in Russia's national enlightenment. The tenor of the official version of the founding of Moscow University can be found in a book on the subject published during the University's bicentennial celebration in 1955. Its author complains that "on the question of the founding of the University and of Lomonosov's role, antiscientific and antipatriotic conceptions created by bourgeois and aristocratic historiography are still widespread."[8] Officially, at least, the up-to-date version of Lomonosov's association with Moscow University has become firmly anchored enough for the University to be named after him.

A generation before the University was founded, Peter the Great had wrenched Russia from its feudal slumbers and begun the westernization of the country. The first problem encountered in Russia's long, forced march toward modernity was a pressing need for scientists and technicians, and, much in the manner of today, the state began sponsoring education on all levels to create

native cadres of scientific specialists. Moscow University was intended as the main training center for these new cadres, but this is not all that was produced there.

The distinguished Russian nineteenth-century scientists who studied at Moscow University include Timiryazev, Sechenov, Lebedev, Zhukovsky, and Chebyshev, but the University also numbers among its graduates men of a different order of being and activity, like Herzen, Belinsky, Lermontov, Turgenev, and Chekhov. For anyone who has a knowledge of Russian history, the mental picture that is conjured up by the mention of the University is that of the *exalté* atmosphere of intellectual ferment in the student circles of the eighteen-twenties and eighteen-thirties: Belinsky's Westerners, Khomyakov's Slavophiles, Stankevich's German Idealists. The Russian revolutionary tradition was forged in the pitched doctrinal battles fought by these groups. The institution which Czar Nicholas I called a "hotbed of vice," was for those who went there an experience in purification and brotherhood and a school of civic virtue. Herzen has left this description: ". . . the University that had fallen into disgrace grew in influence; the youthful strength of Russia streamed to it from all sides, from all classes of society, as into a common reservoir; in its halls they were cleansed from the superstitions they had picked up at the domestic hearth, reached a common level, became like brothers, and dispersed again to all parts of Russia and among all classes of its people."[9] And Turgenev fills in on what became of its scattered alumni: "Today it is rare that a man who writes his own language correctly, an honest and enlightened official, or an upright and firm magistrate, has not at some time been a student at Moscow University."[10]

Throughout the nineteenth century, the University preserved its character as a seedbed of opposition to autocracy. Its history is marked by student strikes and protest demonstrations, as the youth of Moscow University responded to the rising revolutionary rhythm of the country. During the 1905 Revolution, its students played an active role, for which Lenin bestowed upon it the honor of calling it a "revolutionary university." The name has stuck,

and, as the student disturbances there during the Hungarian Revolution would indicate, so perhaps has the spirit.

The most important event in the life of Moscow University during the Soviet period was its move from the old university building on Mokhovaya Street to its new quarters on Lenin Hills, in the burgeoning southwest district of Moscow. Still the heart of Russian higher education, the University has undergone an enormous expansion as the bounding tempo of postwar reconstruction and industrialization called for more and more highly trained professionals. The new University was built under Stalin's personal supervision in a now-condemned architectural style by the architect Rudnev, who was provided with an unlimited budget. It was extremely costly to build and is extremely costly to maintain. In order to achieve a sufficiently imposing style, walls were thickened, with the result that heating costs are excessive. Some of the rooms are so long and narrow and bereft of natural light that electric lights must be kept burning at all times so that the rooms may be used.

The new physical plant, on which construction was begun in 1948 and substantially finished for the opening of the 1953 academic year, consists of thirty-seven buildings clustered around and radiating out from a central thirty-two-story building. This skyscraper, as the Russians call it, literally translating the components of the American word, is an ornate miniature of our less cluttered Empire State Building, down to the detail of the projecting tower, which, in the Russian case, is crowned by a gold star. A towering symbol of the place of science in Soviet society, this building houses only two faculties—physics and chemistry. Lenin Hills is the seat of the four other natural science faculties—mathematics-mechanics, biology-soil, geography, and geology—while the six humanities faculties—history, philology, philosophy, economics, jurisprudence, and journalism—remain in the old building on Mokhovaya Street.[11] Both the sciences and the humanities now have room for further expansion.

The new physical plant also houses 168 lecture halls and 1,700 laboratories, lounges, workrooms, and reading rooms. The

laboratories are lavishly provided with high-quality, modern scientific equipment, nearly all of which is produced domestically at some 500 separate state enterprises. For the entertainment and extracurricular enlightenment of the students there is the all-embracing Soviet Palace of Culture, where lectures, plays, films, concerts, and meetings with scholars, writers, and industrial and Party functionaries take place. Sixty-four amateur groups—with a membership of 3,000 students—which embrace most forms of music, the theater, and the dance, perform and practice there. In Krasnovidov, outside of Moscow, in Gelendzhik on the Black Sea Shore, and on the Riga sea coast, the University maintains resorts and rest homes for those students who can obtain passes from the University Trade-Union Committee. The new dormitory contains 5,750 rooms, each of which is furnished with a bed-sofa, table, chair, desk, and radio. This radio is what the Germans called a *Volksempfänger*, capable of receiving only one station. At Moscow University, the students not fortunate enough to possess privately purchased radios listen to the Moscow City Radio Station.[12] The rooms which do contain privately owned radios fill the dormitory halls almost continuously with the music of the Voice of America's jazz programs and the news reports of the B.B.C. For the everyday needs of the students and the science community, Lenin Hills provides an exhaustive list of service establishments, from shoe-repair shop to savings bank. There are six washing machines.

The University's Gorki Library, founded in 1756, the second-oldest scholarly library in Russia, was divided with the University, and its science section followed the science faculties to their new location. Through the years it has built up a collection of over 5,000,000 books. The University is especially proud of its collection, which, as its catalogue announces, is "saturated" with the classics of Marxism-Leninism. A Soviet library is like a vault for classified documents; not everything circulates freely, and for certain materials one needs special passes, granted only to special, trusted people.[13] As one librarian told a recent American visitor, extracurricular reading, consisting of "approved" bibliographies,

is courteously supplied to ordinary university students, out of consideration for the average student's laziness.

Since the launching of the sputnik, the Moscow University faculty member best known in the West is A. N. Nesmeyanov, the President of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, who lectures in chemistry. But he is not its only distinguished faculty member. The senior faculty roster at the Moscow University reads like a list of leaders in Soviet science and scholarship. In 1955, it included thirty-five full members of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences and fifty-five corresponding members, thirty-three members of the various academies of sciences of the Union, and 126 Stalin Prize winners. A professor's salary at Moscow University is about sixteen times that of a common Soviet laborer, in addition to which he earns money from other sources. Writing texts at the rate of 1,500 to 2,000 rubles per "author's sheet" (about fifteen 6″ x 9″ printed pages) is a very profitable business, with the result that Soviet textbooks have grown to such proportions that time-pressed students have made it a widespread practice to rely solely on class notes. In 1956, the entire teaching staff numbered 2,659 professors, assistant professors, instructors, and scientific associates. In 1955, it was calculated to stand in a 1 to 6.6 ratio to resident students, the lowest student–teacher ratio of all the thirty-nine Soviet universities.[14]

The present enrollment of 22,000 undergraduates (including nearly 6,000 extension students) is four times as great as that of 1940 and over twice that of 1948. If the Soviet selection system works properly, the quality of the students at Moscow University is up to that of their teachers. Because it is located in the capital, and because it and its students are accorded the status befitting an elite institution, each year brings an avalanche of applicants for the available first-year vacancies, and as the Soviet Union moved toward the announced goal of universal ten-year education by 1960 (now abandoned), the swelling secondary-school graduating classes meant greater numbers of hopefuls for Moscow University.

Theoretically, the only way to get into Moscow University,

or any other Soviet institution of higher learning, is by passing competitive entrance examinations. Moscow University's glamour and the actual benefits conferred upon its graduates act as a magnet for the cream of the ten-year-school graduating classes, so that one would expect to find the very best Soviet students there. Actually, a preferential selection process prevails in "colossal" proportions, especially at Moscow University.[15] But those people who do not possess a distinguished name, or the money or connections to get to the right people, must depend on the grades they receive in the entrance examinations. At Moscow University nothing less than a straight A average will do. The number and types of examinations a student takes depend on the faculty to which he has applied. In their degree of difficulty, the examinations range from low for foreign languages, which Soviet students cannot seem to learn well despite six years of study in the secondary schools, to very impressive for mathematics. Alexander Korol, one of the leading American specialists on Soviet education, submitted a set of mathematics problems given to applicants to Moscow University's mechanics-mathematics faculty to Dr. Philip Franklin, a professor of mathematics at M.I.T. Dr. Franklin concluded that the problems were comparable in difficulty to those given at M.I.T. in scholarship and prize competitions.[16]

Examinations are held between August 1 and August 20 of each year, a period of "severe trauma," as a Soviet doctor characterized it, even for those who pass but are put through a second, highest-grade, weeding-out process.[17] An added woe is that 10 per cent of the vacancies are reserved for students from the "people's democracies" and China. Russian students regard the young Chinese seen on the streets of Moscow, who invariably impress Western visitors by their sheer number, in the same way as American students must regard the Russians: inhuman learning machines forever buried in their books, craving no time for relaxation and entertainment.

The question of Soviet stipends is a controversial one, but, again on the testimony of a recent graduate, they are of minor

significance, at least at Moscow University. For the vast majority of the students at Moscow University, the sons and daughters of the upper crust, the stipends are no more than pocket money. At the institutes, especially the provincial ones, the picture changes, and here we find students who do depend upon stipends for their maintenance. However, the stipend system at Moscow University is typical for Soviet universities and illustrates the general mechanism involved. To those who receive average grades of "good" or better on the entrance examinations, and to those who won medals at the secondary schools, stipends of 290 rubles per month during the first term of the freshman year are awarded automatically. This puts the minimum stipends just a trifle below the wages of the "babushkaed" ladies who sweep the streets of Moscow—not enough for a student to get by on in Moscow, but a help in the provinces. Previously these students would continue to draw stipends as long as they maintained an average of "good," while students who were not granted stipends during their first semester received them upon attaining a semester average of "good." The idea behind this typical Soviet incentive device was to get the maximum effort from students and the minimum abuse of Soviet funds. But the press used pathetic examples to illustrate that the fear of falling grades had become another traumatic area of Soviet higher education, and in September, 1956, the authorities relented and began taking yearly "progress" and financial need into account.[18] Stipends go up to 500 rubles per month in the senior year and are increased 25 per cent for students whose grades were all "excellent" in the preceding semester. More than 90 per cent of the students at Moscow University are financed by the state. Stipends may be withdrawn for infractions of "discipline."

The labors of the Soviet student are proverbial. Like the Soviet worker, he works a six-day week, and in his freshman year at Moscow University six hours of class attendance a day are compulsory. The school year begins on September 1 and runs through the end of May or the first week of June. There are three or four weeks of examinations in June and in January and

a two-week mid-winter recess; July and August are vacation months. An average university curriculum, planned by the Ministry of Higher Education for all the specialties and subspecialties within the fields of professional training, calls for five years of undergraduate residence. Korol has estimated that a Soviet freshman spends 70 per cent more time in scheduled classes than his counterpart at M.I.T., and that as far as the entire undergraduate course is concerned "it would take over six years of residence in an American university to accumulate as much actual school time as is provided for in the five-year curricula of Soviet schools."[19]

Students study anything from Turkic and Iranian philology to ichthyology and plant physiology in the 210 departments into which the twelve faculties are divided. But half of the students at Moscow University are enrolled in the natural science faculties —a proportion which holds for the over-all Soviet university enrollment and which is unique and unparalleled in any other educational system. All Moscow University students are required to take courses in principles of Marxism-Leninism, political economy, and dialectical and historical materialism. A student specializing in physics spends a total of 504 hours, spread out over the entire five-year course, listening to lectures in these subjects. This, says the Moscow University catalogue, is calculated to broaden the scientist's horizon and to enable him to generalize his experimental results from correct philosophical positions. One Soviet philosophy teacher compared himself to the old Czarist clergymen who were expected to make periodic visits to each class to drone through the Scripture lesson, while the students, if they caused no trouble, were by tacit consent permitted to sleep through the hour.[20] The trammeling of the humanities by Soviet philosophy has been disastrous, but, except for Lysenko, it does not seem to have hindered the sciences seriously.

The culmination of the five-year program at Moscow University is the diploma project, a minor exercise in independent research like the American senior thesis, to which most of the last year is devoted. Training ends with the defense of the diploma

project before a departmental board and state accrediting examinations taken before the State Examining Commission. The best students go on to graduate work in research institutions or at Moscow and other universities, while most become secondary-school teachers. (Since 1955-56, 80 per cent from the philology, history, geography, and biology-soil faculties, and over 60 per cent from the physics, mathematics, and chemistry faculties have been assigned to teaching.)[21] The rest are dispersed to all parts of the Soviet Union and work among all classes of its peoples in factory laboratories, on state farms and machine and tractor stations, at experimental stations, in publishing houses, archives, museums, and government offices. In 1940, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet awarded Moscow University the Order of Lenin for outstanding contributions to the development of Soviet science and culture. In 1955, the University was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labor for the same services.

The full name of the University is: Moscow State University of the Order of Lenin and of the Order of the Red Banner of Labor, Named for M. V. Lomonosov.

11. Some Sociological Perspectives on Soviet Education: Selection and Training for Advanced Studies

by MARK G. FIELD

Contemporary Soviet society may be characterized as a large-scale "social system" in a state of rapid social, cultural, and economic transition from an agricultural to an industrial order.[1] Politically, it is a society in which all power has been concentrated into the hands of a single Party, tightly organized, militant, hierarchic, and centralized, controlled by a small group of men (and eventually one man).[2] This Party considers itself the corporate expression of a body of thought, of a doctrine, or of an ideology. It sees its task as the remaking of Russian society along certain ideologically and realistically determined goals. It is thus a mobilized society, a garrison state in which most social resources and processes are husbanded toward fulfilling the goals of the regime.

The term "social system"[3] used above refers to a complex of meaningfully related, differentiated, and dependent elements. The operation and the stability of that system depends largely on the predictability of the functioning of its constituent parts, i.e., on the individual members of society performing their social roles according to socially sanctioned expectations. This predictability, in turn, depends on the existence and functioning of two major "maintenance" mechanisms: education and medicine. Education develops the capacity to achieve (or perform), medicine con-

serves this capacity.[4] Without education or medicine, no society, and particularly no contemporary industrial society, could survive for long.

This essay will focus on various aspects of Soviet education, though an attempt will be made at the end to link it with medicine and to relate both to Soviet society and its future development.

If society is conceived as a system, it is also possible to view the contemporary world as a system of societies in which whatever happens in one society is always, actually or potentially, directly or indirectly, relevant to other societies.[5] One can, for example, visualize the impact upon the Soviet leadership of the explosion of an atom bomb over Japan by the United States in 1945. This event must have led to a series of important decisions and actions aimed at re-establishing pre-Hiroshima parity. By the same token, the launching of the first sputnik has had a profound impact on American society and has led to a general questioning of the American educational and scientific establishment.

The decision on the part of Soviet leaders in the late twenties to industrialize Russia under forced draft in order to enable the country to compete successfully with other large powers[6] was also due to certain aspects of the world situation, particularly the fact that no proletarian revolution of any consequence or duration had taken place in the West, and none seemed likely to occur in the foreseeable future. This automatically eliminated the likelihood that any Western proletariat would come to the aid of Russia and necessitated the gigantic efforts, sacrifices, and enforced savings that were characteristic of the Soviet industrialization drive.

Industrialization, as such, not only requires large amounts of capital, but also the development of a body of specialists capable of advancing technology, and eventually scientists able to solve the basic problems inherent in this process. Science, scientific research and personnel, and higher education are thus vital elements of industrialization.

Preliminary Considerations

Alfred North Whitehead once said: "In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute; the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed."[7] Whitehead spoke of two distinct but interrelated elements: training and intelligence. Intelligence (whatever its definition) exists only as a potential in the individual at birth, to be revealed and developed by training. It may, furthermore, be posited that innate intelligence is distributed at random among the members or classes of the population[8] (as are, for example, body types). But the conditions that will permit this potential intelligence to be trained are largely determined by social, cultural, political, and economic factors. Insofar as training develops potential intelligence and talent (in the same way the developing bath reveals the latent image, or lack of image, on an exposed sheet of photographic paper or film), access to training is perhaps the most critical aspect of education. Ideally, access to training ought to be available to all at as early an age as possible, in order to reveal and develop the latent talent in the population. There are many obstacles to the realization of this ideal. Among the major ones is that each child (with few exceptions) is born and brought up in a family. The family itself is a solidary social group, with each member sharing the same quarters and enjoying the same standard of living and status in the society. In contemporary industrial society, and particularly in Soviet society, these aspects of the family are determined by the involvement of the head of the family in the occupational structure. Since every society (and particularly industrial society because of the nature of the production process which always requires a hierarchic arrangement) is stratified, the position of the head of the family in the occupational structure will also determine the position of his family in the social system. Thus the wife and particularly the children enjoy a position which they have not "earned" themselves, but which they derive from, and share with, the husband and father. But since socio-economic status depends on occupation, and occupation in turn depends

on education, the transmission of status from one generation to another consists of the transmission of access to education. Coupled with this, there is often a tendency on the part of those having high status to attempt to monopolize education for their children and, as a corollary, to enforce closure against the children of other classes.[9] But access to education, or its availability, is not the whole story; the child who is to be educated must be motivated to obtain this education. The generation of this motivation or ambition is an important function of the family. It cannot be assumed that any and every child craves an education, without prompting and guidance by parents. Education must be presented to the child as a value in itself, to be striven for, an opening of the way to certain material, honorific, and spiritual rewards. Such a presentation is, of course, much easier for the family of means, since it does not depend on the child's earning an income at an early age, as does the working-class family. In the latter, other values are imparted to the child, such as the need to work, to earn a living, and to be self-sufficient. This monopolization of access to education (never perfect, to be sure) in turn narrows the social base from which potential or "innate" talent is selected. It thus deprives some innate intelligence of the opportunity of being trained. Furthermore, so long as children are brought up in a family system and so long as there exist social differentiations, absolute equality of opportunity (or the development of potential intelligence) through access to training will remain highly problematical, since it makes a great deal of difference where the individual starts from.[10] There are, of course, other obstacles that prevent "new" members of society from revealing whether they have intelligence, or that keep revealed talent from gaining access to higher training, causing (potentially, at least) a loss to society. These obstacles might result from "accidents of birth" such as sex, ethnicity, geographical location, or from discrimination against some members of the population.

The recognition by the Bolsheviks of the importance of the monopolization of educational opportunities by the Czarist middle and upper classes and of the need to open these opportunities to all classes was based on political considerations rather than on

the desire to search for talent. Indeed, in the early years of the regime, the principle of throwing educational opportunities open to the social classes that had previously been deprived of such opportunities was coupled with measures restricting the educational opportunities of members and children of members of the "former exploiting classes."[11] During the twenties, access to education was given preferentially to those of "favorable" social background, and access to higher education in particular was available to those who had demonstrated their loyalty to the regime and were members of the Party or Komsomol.[12] This access was thus often determined not by academic criteria of achievements but on *political* grounds. Scholastic advancement, academic appointments, the passing of examinations were often decided on the basis of political factors rather than on merit and hard work. Indeed, the weakening of the authority of teachers and professors, the lack of discipline, the running of school affairs by students could only lead to the graduation of many mediocre, unqualified, though politically reliable persons.[13] But when it came to designing an industrial plant, building a bridge or a power station, performing a delicate brain operation, or teaching calculus, familiarity with the works of Marx or Lenin, the right proletarian background, the most fanatic loyalty, or the Party card in one's pocket were not enough. The decision to industrialize implied the need for a corps of well-trained, intelligent individuals recruited on the basis of merit, regardless of their social class.

While the decision to industrialize changed the face of Russia and had an impact on all aspects of Soviet society, including education, the subsequent parts of this essay will focus primarily, though not exclusively, on some of the implications these changes have had for advanced training.

The Period Between the Wars

While it is true that even in the twenties academic standards were slowly being raised, the real changes took place after the inception of the First Five-Year Plan. During the thirties, there

was a shift away from the class or political approach to education. This shift was accompanied by a tightening of the requirements for admission to advanced studies. These began to be based on scholastic competition and ability, i.e., on universalistic and objective performance criteria. Traditional teaching methods and discipline were reintroduced in the classroom, and the role of the Party and Komsomol was curtailed drastically.[14] The whole structure of higher education underwent a radical change, with academic ranks and degrees re-established and with a spectacular increase in the social status and the rewards of the professorial corps.

There is ground for believing that the measures shifting education, and particularly higher education, to a more objective assessment of ability and performance (a change from the Party to the report card) benefited those members of the population and their children who were motivated to regard education as a value in itself. The old intelligentsia, as well as the new Soviet intelligentsia which had come up the "hard way," wished to pass on to their children the educational advantages to which their past or present positions entitled them.[15] Conversely, these measures put the children of industrial and farm workers at a disadvantage. Indeed, the development of Soviet society after the beginning of the five-year plans shows a definite drift toward stratification, the solidification of class lines, closure, and the passing on of advantages of all types to one's children.[16] Stalin himself, in his famous speech on "New Conditions—New Tasks in Economic Construction" delivered in June, 1931, had started the trend by attacking the practice of wage equalization or equality mongering as a leftist deviation and by pointing out how absurd it was that "a rolling-mill hand in a steel mill should earn no more than a sweeper . . . a railway-locomotive driver . . . only as much as a copying clerk." He argued, furthermore, that such a situation deprived the unskilled worker of the motivation to acquire skills[17] (the improvement of skill and the acquisition of knowledge being precisely what the Soviet Union needed for the industrialization drive).

The increased severity of labor laws,[18] the introduction of tuition fees in the last three years of secondary school and in the universities and institutes,[19] the 1940 law on labor reserves,[20] the ever-increasing income differentiation, the wartime reintroduction of rank insignia similar to Czarist symbols and of uniforms for most civil servants,[21] the introduction of different medals and orders for enlisted men and officers,[22] and the abolition of the inheritance tax[23] were all significant bench marks in the growing stratification of Soviet society and, presumably, in the monopolization of education by the upper and middle classes.[24] It may be inferred, furthermore, that this trend, so contrary to some basic tenets of Soviet ideology, may have begun to cause the regime serious concern during the fifties. This concern seemed to stem from practical considerations as well as ideological ones. For once again, this trend, if allowed to run unchecked, would tend to limit the social base from which potential talent could be recruited and trained. In view of the importance of science and technology, such tendencies, over a long period, might have serious consequences, perhaps not as serious as the "class approach" of the nineteen-twenties, but serious nonetheless. Moreover, the ideological problem, caused not so much by the existence of income differentials and other status advantages, but by the ability of fathers to pass educational advantages to their sons and daughters, should not be overlooked. The existence of a "golden youth," of children having access to higher education because of their parents' position (education therefore becoming a "social grace," a mark of status rather than the means to a fruitful occupation), the bribing of school officials to admit undeserving students of "good families," the refusal by many of these students to accept assigned posts in the countryside after graduation or to work at all, and the ability to use connections and influence to back up this refusal—these and other manipulations of the system for individual, nonsocial purposes were a flagrant violation of some basic Soviet tenets about opportunities being open to all and about the function of education.[25]

The Present Situation

Perhaps one must examine recent educational changes in the light of these developments,[26] though other explanations, some not contradictory to the hypothesis, present themselves. While one might discount official Soviet statements to the effect that the U.S.S.R. is now in the position of realizing the "ancient idea" of merging education and productive labor,[27] a case could be made for the contention that the severe labor shortage (caused by the drop of the birth rate during World War II) presently necessitates the maximum utilization of available manpower. There are two further aspects: one, that the overabundance of specialists, professionals, and scientists which has attracted so much attention in the West recently may serve to tide the Soviet Union over the lean manpower years to come;[28] and two, the increased scope of secondary education together with the demands of industry and agriculture for manpower has reduced the ratio of admittance to higher institutions of learning to only one in four applicants,[29] thereby permitting a finer screening of applicants and higher standards of preparation. Recent measures are aimed at ensuring a better selection of students by widening the social base, thus affording greater opportunity to uncover and develop talent. The *internaty*, or boarding schools, for instance, are definitely not upper-class schools built to perpetuate an upper-class style of living and to monopolize chances for upper-class children, but an attempt to provide educational opportunities for the children of underprivileged families.[30] It is thus, ideologically speaking, a democratizing measure, opposite in its intent to the introduction of tuition fees in 1940, which was an aristocratizing measure and which has since been repealed.[31] However, the basic sociological phenomenon remains: the family, as an agent of early motivation and education in a stratified society, is incompatible with complete equality of opportunity, and the boarding schools may well have the effect (in intent, at least) of decreasing the importance of the family and of increasing the importance of the school in generating

motivation and developing talent. There are, of course, limits to a decrease in the role of the family which are set by the very nature of society as a system and by the nature and functions of the family.[32]

It is within the framework of these considerations that developments in the selection and training of personnel for higher studies can be examined. On the whole, one can distinguish, as noted above, a change or evolution away from the considerations of loyalty and ideology that were all-important in the early years of the regime, to criteria of ability and knowledge. A recent article in *Kommunist*[33] states that "socialist society cannot successfully move forward without sufficient numbers of specialists with high qualifications and a Marxist-Leninist Weltanschauung." It may be noted that Marxism-Leninism comes second, something which might not have occurred in earlier years. It may also be suggested that a knowledge of Marxism-Leninism as a prerequisite for advanced work will become more and more a formality. Adlai Stevenson, who visited the Soviet Union in the fall of 1958, reports his impression "that student interest in Communist ideology and in the required indoctrination courses is languid at best."[34]

Historically we can thus delineate the following periods and then trace, in the broadest outline, measures affecting higher education: the period of ideological egalitarianism, roughly between the Revolution and the beginning of the five-year plans, when political and ideological considerations were predominant; the period of realistic stratification, roughly between the beginning of the five-year plans and Stalin's death, when criteria for selection for admission were universalistic but tended to lead to the appropriation of educational opportunities by a restricted segment of the population; and the period of realistic and ideological egalitarianism, which may be beginning now, in which an attempt may be made to preserve equality of opportunity by holding this opportunity open to all members of society, by providing educational advantages to the talented, and by putting a brake on the monopolization of education and the transmission

of this monopoly to the next generation by one segment of the population.

Following the Revolution, and in line with the egalitarian ideas of the times, all academic ranks and degrees were abolished. Those who taught in the universities were called professors; those who taught elsewhere were called teachers.[35] Professors held their title by virtue of their jobs (often obtained on the basis of political considerations), not by virtue of their formal academic achievements. It was only in 1934 that academic ranks based on scholarly achievements were re-established.[36] The past policies of abolishing all ranks and privileges were seen as justified in the early years of the regime, but if continued, it was held, they would only contribute to slowing down the further development of science. The demand for differentiation of rank and the apparent unfairness (and absurdity) of egalitarianism were stated clearly in the following passage, published in 1934:

> Old professors with a world reputation—who had to their credit decades of work in higher educational institutions and had made many important contributions, engineers fresh from the production line, young people who had just graduated from the institute—all held the same position, all held the title of professor or assistant professor (*dotsent*); they occupied the same position in society and had the same standard of living.[37]

The 1934 decree also established two advanced academic degrees, permitting a more thorough and systematic selection and preparation of candidates for higher studies and for positions in teaching and in research. The first degree was that of *candidate of sciences,* the second and most advanced degree was that of *doctor of sciences.* The program of studies and research leading to the candidate degree is called the *aspirantura.* The *aspirant* is thus a student who has completed his advanced university or institute training and who has been selected or has applied for post-graduate work that will lead eventually to research or teaching positions. The *aspirantura* program, therefore, plays a

crucial role in the selection and training of students for higher degrees and advanced work. While space restrictions preclude a survey of the changes that have taken place in the *aspirantura* program since the early thirties, a rapid survey would indicate an effort to raise the academic level of students admitted to the *aspirantura*, to restrict it to those who have completed their higher education, to limit the *aspirantura* programs to the best-staffed and best-equipped institutions of higher learning,[38] to increase and improve faculty supervision of the work of candidates, and to make the awarding of the degree contingent on a series of steps and examinations testing the theoretical, practical, and general knowledge of the individual, plus his ability to work independently, to perform original work, and to defend a dissertation.[39]

A recent official statement pertaining to advanced study, issued as "Instructions from the Ministry of Higher Education" (April 4, 1957) and following some criticisms of higher education at the Twentieth Party Congress of 1956,[40] is indicative of certain problems in this area. The main purpose of the new instructions is to demand higher performance from candidates for the higher degrees. Thus there are more precisely defined requirements to be met in the examination for the candidate degree: dialectical and historical materialism, the basic disciplines relevant to the candidate's field of interest, the special discipline corresponding to the dissertation topic chosen by the applicant, and one foreign language. Another important step in the new instructions is the requirement that academic councils of institutes accept candidate and doctoral dissertations for defense only after their publication as monographs or as separate articles, thus giving these dissertations (and their topics) wide publicity outside the institution where the work was conducted. It may be presumed that this step will ensure higher quality of work, since the reputation of the institution will be involved in the dissemination of research done under its auspices. This will also reduce favoritism and other manifestations of "familyness." There are other requirements introduced in the instructions, such as specifying that candidate

dissertations must contain new scientific and practical conclusions and recommendations. Doctoral dissertations must make significant theoretical contributions to the solution of scientific and practical problems. In addition, the number of readers required for the examination of doctoral dissertations was increased from two to three. The third official reader may be an industrial specialist without a doctor's degree or professorial rank. This may be indicative of a general reorientation of higher scientific work toward practical rather than theoretical problems. There are other requirements, all aimed at improving the quality of the work and making the awarding of the degree dependent on merit and qualifications.[41]

Another measure, in force since 1938, is the centralization of the final confirmation of higher degrees by the Higher Certification Commission (*Vysshaya Attestatsionnaya Komissiya* [*VAK*]), an organization attached to the Ministry of Higher Education, which reviews the work and qualifications of the candidates, and which has the power to reverse decisions of the academic councils that recommend the award of a higher degree.[42] The following example is indicative of the power of the *VAK*. Recently, it was instructed to suspend for a period of up to two years the right to hear the defense of dissertations of any academic council which awards an academic degree for a meritless dissertation or allows gross infractions of the prescribed procedural rules for the defense of dissertations.[43] While this measure is presumably aimed at raising the quality of dissertations, it is also a means of directly applying pressure on academic councils and on theses advisors and is yet another step against the *semeistvennost* (familyness) of academic circles, which may be just as threatening to academic standards as the *partiynost* (adherence to the Party line) of the early years of the regime.

Altogether, between the thirties (when academic degrees were re-established) and 1955, some 80,000 to 90,000 higher degrees were awarded (more than 9,000 doctoral and about 80,000 candidates degrees).[44] This number represents about 3 per cent of those students who finished university or institute

NUMBER OF ASPIRANTS, AND OF THOSE HAVING COMPLETED THE ASPIRANTURA, IN FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME ATTENDANCE, IN UNIVERSITIES AND INSTITUTES, SOVIET UNION, 1940-1941, 1945-1946, 1950-1951, AND 1955-1956 (IN THOUSANDS)[a]

(1) indicates full-time attendance; (2) part-time attendance; (3) total for the year

	1940-1941			1945-1946			1950-1951			1955-1956		
ASPIRANTS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
in universities	11.500	1.700	13.200	6.100	0.800	6.900	11.200	1.300	12.500	13.200	3.600	16.800
in institutes	2.900	0.800	3.700	2.600	0.300	2.900	6.900	2.500	9.400	8.200	4.400	12.600
Total	14.400	2.500	16.900	8.700	1.100	9.800	18.100	3.800	21.900	21.400	8.000	29.400
COMPLETED ASPIRANTURA												
in universities	1.411	.061	1.472	1.080	.084	1.164	2.880	.097	2.977	4.263	.489	4.752
in institutes	.454	.052	.506	.363	.089	.452	1.644	.274	1.918	2.273	.582	2.855
Total	1.865	.113	1.978	1.443	.173	1.616	4.524	.371	4.895	6.536	1.071	7.607

[a] This table is based on figures supplied by *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo SSSR*, pp. 255, 258.

training.[45] In general, the number of *aspirants* per institution is small. Thus in 1955-56, a total of 29,400 students went through the *aspirantura*;[46] the average number per institution was about fifty, and the average number of new degrees granted did not exceed fifteen per accredited institution per year (7,607 finished the *aspirantura* in 1955).[47] The development of the *aspirantura* in universities and institutes, both full-time or part-time, and the number of those who graduated from the *aspirantura* is shown in the preceding table.

The figures under (1) indicate those who were enrolled in *aspirantura* on a full-time basis; those under (2) indicate aspirants studying "without interrupting production work," or part-time; those under (3) show the total number. The rate of growth of category 2 is greater than the rate of growth of the *aspirantura* as a whole. In 1955, the total number of aspirants who completed their training was 3.8 times larger than in 1940; however, the number of full-time students at the universities who completed their program was only three times as large, whereas the number of part-time students was eight times as large. The corresponding figures for the institutes are five and 11.2[48] respectively. In other words, while the number of aspirants is growing, the number of those studying for degrees outside both the university and formal institute training is increasing more rapidly, and the trend is being encouraged. The educational authorities apparently feel that graduate work will be enhanced by previous or simultaneous "practical" experience.[49] Perhaps, as mentioned earlier, another more compelling reason for increasing the proportion of those studying "without interruption of production" is the labor shortage resulting from the declining birth rate during the war years.[50] Those born after 1941 are now entering the labor force.

These figures and aspects of Soviet higher education are sufficient to illustrate the thesis that the system of education and the selection of personnel for training in advanced education has improved considerably since the early thirties and has become

a force to reckon with, as the latest scientific achievements of the Soviet Union testify.[51] For more detail, the reader is referred to the works of DeWitt[52] and Korol.[53]

Conclusion

This essay has attempted to show education, and particularly advanced education, in the perspective of the Soviet social system, and to point out some of the major areas and some of the problems inherent in them. The educational system is, of course, still far from fully efficient. In addition to some of the factors that may interfere with the full development of potential talent (some of which the regime is trying to eliminate), there are other problems of a sociological nature. Thus one could mention certain cultural aspects that prevent the selection of students from a broad social base, such as discrimination against some minorities—the Jews, for example[54]—and, perhaps, against women. While 36 per cent of all scientific workers are women, only 6 per cent of those holding professorial rank and 17 per cent of the assistant professors are women.[55] These aspects may still interfere with the completely efficient selection and training of potentially intelligent individuals. On the whole, however, the trend is toward better, more rational selection and training of personnel. In the nature of modern industrial society, and of the Soviet system particularly, this trend has at least two important implications and components:

1. From the viewpoint of Soviet society as a functioning system, it means a better selection from a wider social base of intelligent individuals potentially capable of solving the problems of science and technology the system faces today and is bound to face in the future;

2. From the ideological viewpoint, it brings again to the fore considerations of equality of opportunity and of democracy, and may thus help reverse the drift toward increased stratification, solidification of class lines, the inheritance of status, and its

corollary of closure. It thus helps remove certain ideological inconsistencies and contradictions and can only contribute to a strengthening of the system.

Finally, one might re-examine briefly the statement at the beginning of this essay that education develops the capacity to achieve and that medicine conserves this capacity. An attempt can be made to establish a relationship between the two areas and project some implications for medicine and public health which derive from the nature of the Soviet system and its type of educational requirements:

1. As a society begins to rely more and more on highly trained specialists and scholars, the society's investment per individual student increases (both because the birth rate tends to fall and training tends to increase in length). It thus becomes imperative to capitalize on individuals and on training by keeping the trained individual healthy and alive and working as long as possible. This means, among other things, an improvement in medicine and public-health measures, and particularly in the quality of these services. One might then expect an increase in the priority order granted the health services over what it has been until now.

2. The functioning of modern industrial society depends more and more on mental rather than on physical labor. The well-integrated, stable personality, free of major psychological pathology, thus becomes much more crucial to society than the strong person free of major physical defects. Complex production and scientific problems are increasingly resolved by brain work, and more and more energy or power becomes available to replace the "hand." Thus the question of mental health will become more salient in this type of society, and medicine will have to turn its attention more to this area than to physical health, where most of the major problems have already been solved. This may well mean an increase in psychiatric personnel and psychiatric research, and much more attention to the functional neuroses than the Soviets have been willing to give hitherto.[56]

These considerations apply not only to the Soviet system, but also to American and other modern industrial societies. In the competition between the Soviet and the Western bloc, these factors already are playing, and will continue to play, a decisive role.

Notes

CHAPTER 1

1. Adapted from the Russian version published in *Vestnik instituta po izucheniyu SSSR,* II, No. 27 (May-August, 1958); translated by Mirra Ginsburg.
2. *Direktivy VKP(b) i postanovleniya sovetskogo pravitelstva o narodnom obrazovanii* (1st ed.; Moscow: 1947), p. 7.
3. Z. S. Kaftanov, *Vysshee obrazovanie v SSSR* (Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya, 1950), p. 13.
4. "Vperedi vsekh stran mira," *Literaturnaya gazeta,* March 27, 1958.
5. N. A. Konstantinov *et al., Osnovnye voprosy pedagogiki* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatelstvo Ministerstva prosveschcheniya, 1957), pp. 54–55.
6. I. K. Kadyrov, "Uspekhi narodnogo obrazovaniya v Sovetskom Uzbekistane," *Uchitelskaya gazeta,* October 31, 1957.
7. "Preodolet posledstviya kulta lichnosti v pedagogike," *Sovetskaya Pedagogika,* No. 9 (1956), p. 7.
8. Y. N. Medynsky, *Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR, 1952), p. 86.
9. Konstantinov *et al., op. cit.,* pp. 122–23.
10. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.; Moscow: 1951), VIII, 468.
11. Medynsky, *op. cit.,* p. 20.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Konstantinov *et al., op. cit.,* p. 56.
14. "O merakh ukrepleniya distsipliny v shkolakh (obmen mneniyami v Akademii pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR)," *Uchitelskaya gazeta,* June 18, 1955.
15. Medynsky, *op. cit.,* pp. 143–44.

16. Y. P. Pichugin, *Pravo na obrazovanie v SSSR* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1957), p. 63.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 57.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
19. Medynsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 150–51.
20. Pichugin, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
21. *Spravochnik dlya postupayushchikh v srednie spetsialnye uchebnye zavedeniya* (Moscow: Sovetskaya nauka, 1957), p. 3.
22. *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo SSSR, statisticheski sbornik* (Moscow: Gosstatizdat, 1956), pp. 230–31.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 232–35. Later figures for the Russian Federation are from *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo RSFSR* (1958), p. 355.
24. Kaftanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 19–28; V. V. Mavrodin, N. G. Sladkevich, L. A. Shilov, *Leningradski universitet* (Leningrad: Leningradski Universitet, 1957), p. 82.
25. Kaftanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 34–38.
26. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.; Moscow: 1954), XXVIII, 418.
27. G. P. Golovinsky, "Novoe v uchebnykh planakh i programakh VTUZ'ov," *Vestnik vysshei shkoly,* No. 5 (1955), p. 19.
28. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.; Moscow: 1955), XXXVIII, 448; *Selskokhozyaistvennaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.; Moscow-Leningrad: 1937), I, 326.
29. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.), XXVIII, 416. The Moscow Institute of Economics had nine departments in 1954.
30. *Ibid.*, VIII, 468.
31. Medynsky, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 170–72.
33. *Pravila priema i programmy priemnykh ekzamenov dlya postupayushchikh v vysshye uchebnye zavedeniya v 1957 g.* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo Sovetskaya nauka, 1957), p. 3; "Novye pravila priema v vysshye uchebnye zavedeniya," *Komsomolskaya pravda,* June 4, 1958, p. 1.
34. *Pravila priema . . .*, p. 21.
35. *Komsomolskaya pravda,* June 4, 1958, p. 1.
36. *Pravila priema . . .*, pp. 4–7; Medynsky, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
37. Medynsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 173–74.
38. *Direktivy XX syezda KPSS po shestomu pyatiletnemu planu razvitiya narodnogo khozyaystva SSSR na 1956–60* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1956), p. 58.
39. V. P. Yelyutin, "Velikoe zavoevanie sotsializma," *Pravda,* November 17, 1957.

40. *Kalendar studenta na 1956–57 uch. god* (Kiev: Gosizdatelstvo tekhnicheskoy literatury USSR, 1956), p. 80.
41. Yelyutin, "Novye bolshie zadachi vysshey shkoly," *Vestnik vysshey shkoly,* No. 1 (1957), p. 6. The seriousness of the situation is indicated by the fact that, in the 1956–57 school year, 4,300 students were expelled for various reasons from Leningrad higher educational institutions alone (A. Didusenko, I. Prelovskaya, "Tvorchestvu, initsiative—shirokuyu dorogu," *Komsomolskaya pravda,* March 13, 1958).
42. *Kalendar studenta na 1956–1957 uch. god* (Kiev: 1956), pp. 84–85.
43. Cited in *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo SSSR, Statisticheski sbornik,* pp. 206–07.
44. *Ibid.,* pp. 208–11.
45. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.; 1950), III, 252.
46. "Za korennoe uluchshenie podgotovki nauchnykh kadrov," editorial, *Izvestiya,* September 15, 1956.
47. *Narodnoe obrazovannie v SSSR,* edited by I. A. Kairov *et al.* (Moscow: Akademiya pedagogicheskikh nauk, 1957), p. 456.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Yelyutin, "Velikoe zavoevanie sotsializma," *Pravda,* November 17, 1957.
50. N. K. Goncharov, "O perspektivnom plane razvitiya narodnogo obrazovaniya v SSSR na blizhayshie 15–20 let," *Sovetskaya pedagogika,* No. 4 (1957), pp. 16–17.
51. N. S. Khrushchev, "Vospityvat aktivnykh i soznatelnykh stroiteley kommunisticheskogo obshchestva, rech na XIII sezde VLKSM 18 aprelya 1958 g.," *Izvestiya,* April 19, 1958.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Y. I. Afanasenko, "rech na XIII sezde VLKSM," *Komsomolskaya pravda,* April 19, 1958.
54. N. Nezhinsky, "Vazhny vopros," *Kommunist,* No. 5 (1958), p. 120.
55. The most extensive Soviet document preceding the enactment of the law on December 24, was published in *Pravda,* November 16, 1958, pp. 1–3, "Ob ukreplenii svyazi shkoly s zhiznyu i o dalneyshem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniya v strane; Tezisy TsK KPSS i Soveta Ministrov SSSR." *See also* Albert Boiter, "Khrushchev's School Reform," *Comparative Education Review,* II, No. 3 (February, 1959), 8–13.
56. The final text of the law differs in only few respects from the

November 16 theses. The law makes no provision for the few issues in the theses, such as schools for the gifted, language of instruction in nationality schools, or study of home economics for girls, which seem to have aroused public opposition upon publication of the theses. The Party's official point of view on these problems was published in *Pravda* on December 22. There are also some minor new additions in the laws such as the assignment of jurisdiction over various types of schools, the *uchilishcha* and the *tekhnikumy* being assigned to the Union level, whereas the general education schools remain subordinated to the republics.

CHAPTER 2

1. Karl Marx, *Capital* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954), I, 299.
2. N. K. Krupskaya, *N. K. Krupskaya on Education* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1957), p. 193.
3. Krupskaya, *op. cit.*, p. 194.
4. Alexander G. Korol, *Soviet Education for Science and Technology* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957), p. 27.
5. Krupskaya, *op. cit.*, pp. 194–96.
6. George S. Counts, *The Challenge of Soviet Education* (New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957), pp. 44–45.
7. Korol, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
8. M. Saburov, *Report on the Directives of the 19th Party Congress* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952), p. 53.
9. *See* M. A. Melinkov and M. N. Skatkin (eds.), *Politekhnicheskoe obuchenie v obshcheobrazovatelnoy shkole* (Moscow: RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, 1953).
10. Korol, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–32.
11. V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers Company, 1945), XXIII, 215.
12. N. S. Khrushchev, *Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Party Congress* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956), pp. 96–97.
13. George Z. F. Bereday, "Recent Developments in Soviet Education," *Comparative Education Review*, I, No. 2, (October, 1957).
14. George Z. F. Bereday, unpublished notes taken while observing Soviet schools as a member of the United States Office of Education delegation in the Cultural Exchange Program, Spring, 1958.

15. George Z. F. Bereday and Richard V. Rapacz, "Khrushchev's Proposals for Soviet Education," *Teachers College Record,* December, 1958, pp. 138–49.
16. S. Seryegin, "S pozitsii budushchego: O nekotorykh voprosakh podgotovki molodykh spetsialistov," *Komsomolskaya pravda,* June 10, 1958.
17. I. A. Kairov, "Nazrevshie voprosy narodnogo obrazovaniya," *Pravda,* September 6, 1958.
18. G. I. Zelenko, "Vazhnye problemy narodnogo obrazovaniya," *Komsomolskaya pravda,* September 10, 1958.
19. Khrushchev, "Ob ukreplennii svyazi shkoly s zhiznyu i o dalneyshem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniya v strane," *Pravda,* September 21, 1958.
20. N. N. Semenov, "Zaglyadyvaya v zavtrashni den," *Pravda,* October 17, 1958.
21. Central Committee of the Communist Party and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, "Ob ukreplennii svyazi shkoly s zhiznyu i o dalneyshem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniya v strane," *Pravda,* November 16, 1958.
22. Supreme Soviet Legislation, "Zakon," *Pravda,* December 25, 1958.

CHAPTER 3

1. Cf. Nicholas DeWitt, *Soviet Professional Manpower* (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1955), pp. 20–23, and Alexander G. Korol, *Soviet Education for Science and Technology* (New York: The Technology Press of M.I.T. and John Wiley & Sons, 1957), pp. 145ff.
2. Biographic data from the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., Munich, Germany, and its *Biographic Directory of the U.S.S.R.* (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1958).
3. Cf. DeWitt, *op. cit.,* p. 179.
4. *Partiynaya zhizn,* No. 1 (January, 1958), p. 15.
5. *Pravda,* March 26, 1957, p. 2.
6. *Pravda,* February 19, 1956, p. 3.
7. A. N. Volkovsky and M. P. Malyshev, *Shkolovedenie* (R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, 1952), p. 115.
8. *Partiynaya zhizn,* No. 1 (January, 1958), p. 21.
9. *See* biography of S. M. Ravnopolets in *Biographic Directory of the U.S.S.R.,* p. 527.
10. *Partiynaya zhizn,* No. 1 (January, 1958), p. 19.

11. Merle Fainsod, *Smolensk under Soviet Rule* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 345ff.
12. *Partiynaya zihzn,* No. 3 (February, 1958), p. 13.
13. *Ibid.,* No. 13 (July, 1958), p. 33.
14. *Ibid.,* No. 19 (October, 1958), p. 24.
15. *Ibid.,* p. 25.
16. *Vestnik vysshey shkoly,* No. 6 (1958), pp. 7–8.
17. *Ibid.,* No. 4 (1958), pp. 67–68.
18. *Partiynaya zhizn,* No. 8 (April, 1958), p. 70.
19. *Ibid.,* No. 9 (May, 1957), pp. 36–39.
20. *Ibid.,* No. 18 (September, 1958), p. 63.
21. *Ibid.,* No. 1 (January, 1958), p. 18.
22. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.; Moscow: 1951), IX, 336.
23. *Zarya Vostoka,* October 2, 1956.
24. *O partiynoy rabote v VUZ'akh* (Moscow: Sbornik statey, Gospolitizdat, 1958); cited in *Partiynaya zhizn,* No. 11 (June, 1958), p. 75.
25. *Vestnik vysshey shkoly,* No. 5 (1958), p. 4.
26. N. A. Mikhailov, *VKP (b)—Organizator i rukovoditel Komsomola* (Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya, 1951), p. 4.
27. *Komsomolskaya pravda,* April 16, 1958.
28. *Izvestiya,* June 18, 1958.
29. *See Uchitelskaya gazeta,* September 13, 1958, for a complete set of regulations governing this relationship.
30. Article by P. V. Shmyrov in *Vestnik vysshey shkoly,* No. 2 (1958), p. 6.
31. *Ibid.,* p. 4.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Partiynaya zhizn,* No. 19 (October, 1958), p. 25.
34. F. V. Konstantinov in *Kommunist,* No. 9 (June, 1957).

CHAPTER 4

1. These and several other aspects of Soviet life and education mentioned throughout the essay are from the writer's personal observations in the Soviet Union in May and June, 1958, made as member of the United States Office of Education delegation sent under the February, 1958, cultural exchange agreement between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

2. For instance, *see*: "Istoriya odnogo podarka," *Pravda,* September 26, 1957, p. 2.
3. Several others were mentioned in a previous article: G. Z. F. Bereday, "American and Soviet Scientific Potential," *Social Problems,* IV, No. 3 (January, 1957), 212–13 and footnotes.
4. Vera Sandominsky, "The Spirit of the New Soviet Middle Class," *The Russian Review,* XIII, No. 3 (1954), 193–94.
5. C. E. Black (ed.), *The Transformation of the Russian Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960). Part III, devoted to Social Stratification, contains the following articles: Robert Feldmesser, "The Reality of Social Classes"; George Fischer, "The Intelligentsia"; Alf Edeen, "The Civil Service"; Lazar Volin, "The Russian Peasant"; Jerzy Gliksman, "The Russian Worker"; Raymond Garthoff, "The Military as a Social Force"; Alex Inkeles, "Summary and Conclusions."
6. Milovan Djilas, *The New Class* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957), pp. 53–54. Other contributions (by ex-Soviet citizens) include: Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov, "The Soviet Ruling Class," *Bulletin,* Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., V, No. 9, (September, 1958); David Burg, "The Continuing Temptation," *Soviet Survey,* No. 26, (October-December, 1958).
7. Alex Inkeles, "Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union," in R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, *Class, Status, and Power* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), p. 620.
8. M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953), p. 99.
9. I. A. Kairov, N. K. Goncharov, B. P. Yesipov, L. V. Zankov, *Pedagogika* (Moscow: 1956), p. 313.
10. "Otstupnik, tak on i nazyvaetsya," *Komsomolskaya pravda,* July 9, 1958, p. 2.
11. "Shkoly neskolkikh napravleni ne nuzhny," *Pravda,* December 8, 1958, p. 3.
12. *See* G. Z. F. Bereday, "Recent Developments in the Soviet Schools, II," *Comparative Education Review,* I, No. 2, (October, 1957), 14, 15.
13. These views are best set forth in G. M. Dulnev and A. R. Luria, *Principy otbora detei vo vspomogatelnye shkoly,* (Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, 1956), *see* especially pp. 9–24.
14. A. S. Neill, *Hearts, Not Heads, in Schools* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1944), pp. 129–30. He refers to an article by M. Tsuzmer in *Soviet War News,* November 6, 1943.

15. "Vseobuchenye — vazhneishaya gosudarstvennaya zadacha," *Uchitelskaya gazeta,* January 13, 1959, p. 1.
16. Described in an earlier essay by R. V. Rapacz.
17. "Chitateli predlagayut," *Literaturnaya gazeta,* December 18, 1958.
18. G. Z. F. Bereday and R. V. Rapacz, "Khrushchev's Proposals for Soviet Education," *Teachers College Record,* December, 1958, p, 141.
19. J. K. Galbraith, "Heresy Revisited," *Encounter,* XII, No. 1, (January, 1959), 45.
20. See G. Z. F. Bereday, "Comparative Approach to Social Status in English Education," in Bereday (ed.), *Liberal Traditions in Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1958).
21. The writer had access to the *Qualitative File,* Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System, Russian Research Center, Harvard University, where he served as Research Assistant in 1951–52. He is indebted to the Russian Research Center and to Professor Alex Inkeles for permission to use the materials in the *File* for his own research. In order to retain the personal flavor of the case histories, the excerpts quoted here are rendered in the exact words in which they appear in the Harvard files.
22. *See,* for instance, Richard Renfield, "The Soviets are Criticizing Their Schools," *NEA Journal* (March, 1959), pp. 22–25, 78.
23. Harvard Russian Research Center, *Qualitative File,* Category 2110, File 5, Interview 102, p. 54. (All further citations will be referred to in the following sequence: HQF 2110/[file no.]/[interview no.]/[page no.])
24. HQF 2110/16/1069/38 and 50.
25. HQF 2110/5/109/19.
26. HQF 2110/5/125/20.
27. HQF 2110/6/127/8.
28. HQF 2110/5/109/18.
29. HQF 2110/4/74/33.
30. HQF 2110/5/100/14.
31. HQF/2110/1/6/54.
32. HQF 2110/1354/17/77.
33. The social composition of this school is, nevertheless, heavily working class, since ballet dancers, apart from outstanding performers, are not unusually well paid. The social role of ballet, as a profession, is comparable to careers in baseball and jazz bands in American society.

34. HQF 2110/1/6/13.
35. HQF 2110/11/420/4.
36. Wolfgang Leonhard, *Child of the Revolution* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1958), pp. 23–44.
37. *See* David Burg's essay, p. 120.
38. HQF 2110/18/1507/12.
39. HQF 2110/16/1123/22.
40. HQF 2110/7/156/60.
41. From a personal statement by David Burg.
42. HQF 2110/8/258/42.
43. For instance, M. Voronin, "O selskoy molodezhi i lubvi v kolkhoznom trude," *Selskoe khozyaystvo,* January 8, 1958.
44. G. Z. F. Bereday and R. V. Rapacz, *op. cit.,* p. 142.
45. HQF 2110/11/415/31.
46. L. Z. Kaganovich, *Ocherk razvitiya statistiki shkolnogo obrazovaniya v SSSR* (Moscow: 1957), table 13, p. 88.
47. HQF 2110/18/1578/3*b*.
48. HQF 2110/1/9/6, 9, 10.
49. HQF 2110/15/642/7.
50. HQF 2110/17/1354/47.
51. HQF 2110/8/258/54, 55.
52. HQF 2110/14/529/51.
53. HQF 2110/16/1109/21.
54. HQF 2110/10/386/5.
55. HQF 2110/17/1354/36, 39, 40.
56. *Current Digest of Soviet Press,* IX, No. 28, (August 21, 1957), 28.
57. HQF 2110/12/571/38.
58. HQF 2110/10/378/18.
59. HQF 2110/11/420/25.
60. HQF 2110/17/1467/21.
61. HQF 2110/9/366/61.
62. Reprinted in D. L. Meek, *Soviet Youth* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1957), pp. 178–79.
63. HQF 2110/8/191/21.
64. A less printable comment reads: "The Soviet power is very good. In Czarist times, my posterior was all closed in and dark, but now my pants are torn and my posterior can at least see the light of day." HQF 2110/8/275/27.
65. HQF 2110/15/602/18.
66. HQF 2110/12/455/13.
67. HQF 2110/6/138/30.

68. HQF 2110/9/332/19.
69. HQF 2110/3/51/13, 29.
70. HQF 2110/1/5/31.

CHAPTER 5

1. This essay has been translated from a manuscript in Italian by Eliana Covacich.
2. V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya* (4th ed.; Moscow: 1952), X, 66.
3. *Kommunist,* No. 7 (1953), p. 89.
4. *Molodoy kommunist,* No. 8 (1953), p. 123.
5. *Prepodavaniye istorii v shkole,* No. 4 (1953).
6. *Semya i shkola,* No. 11 (1954), pp. 10–12.
7. *Trud,* December 23, 1954.
8. *Voprosy filosofii,* No. 6 (1954), pp. 76–88.
9. *Sovetskaya pedagogika,* No. 8 (1954), pp. 3–14.
10. *Ibid.,* No. 5 (1955), pp. 3–19.
11. *Ibid.,* No. 7 (1955), pp. 62–69.
12. *Nauka i zhizn,* No. 4 (1957), p. 68.
13. O. G. Dzeverin, *Atheistic Education in the Schools* (Kiev: 1956), pp. 92–93. *See also Natural Sciences and Religion,* published in Russian (Moscow: 1956) and in Ukrainian (Kiev: 1957).
14. *Organization and Education of the School Group,* supplement to the journal *Sovetskaya pedagogika,* 1954, pp. 317–18.
15. *Pravda,* February 1, 1958.
16. *Nauka i zhizn,* No. 1 (1957), p. 44.
17. *Ibid.,* p. 43.
18. *Matematika v shkole,* November-December, 1957. On the anti-religious teaching method in biology lessons, *see* the journal *Biologiya v shkole,* November-December, 1957, pp. 20–25.
19. *Komsomolskaya pravda,* January 1, 1958.
20. V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya,* (3rd ed.; Moscow: 1934), XXVII, 183–88.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Izvestiya,* May 7, 1955.
23. V. V. Zenkovsky, *O mnimom materializme russkoy nauki i filosofii* (Munich: 1956), p. 18.
24. *Nauka i zhizn,* No. 6 (1955), p. 41.
25. *Vestnik instituta po izucheniyu istorii i kultury SSSR,* No. 6 (1954), p. 126; No. 4 (1955), pp. 58–78; No. 1 (1956), pp. 77–83.

26. M. V. Yakovlev, *The Democratic Russian Revolutionaries in the War Against Religion* (Moscow: 1955).
27. S. Tyszkiewicz, "Antireligious literature in the U.S.S.R.," *Bulletin de l'Association d'études et d'informations politiques internationales*, March 1–15, 1954. Supplement to No. 105.
28. V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya* (4th ed.; Moscow: 1952), X, 65–69.
29. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, No. 5 (1955), p. 8; *Nauka i zhizn*, No. 7 (1955).
30. D. Sidorov, *Scientific Previsions and Religious Prophecies* (Moscow: 1951), pp. 36–37.
31. Stalin in his last work, *The Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, outlined three basic conditions for the advent of Communism. Their utopian character is quite obvious.
32. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Works* (1st ed.); I, 528 (in Russian).
33. This theory was condemned many years ago; *Komsomolskaya pravda*, March 24, 1937.
34. *Nauka i zhizn*, No. 1 (1958), p. 51. At one time the League of the Militant Atheists used to organize certain antireligious demonstrations of great crudity; *see* I. A. Flerov, *For the Active Forms of Antireligious Work Among Youngsters* (Moscow: 1939).
35. L. Zilberberg, *The Use of the Cinema in Scientific-Atheistic Propaganda* (Moscow: 1956).
36. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
37. *Nauka i zhizn*, No. 8 (1957), p. 43.
38. *Literaturnaya gazeta*, November 13, 1954.
39. *Pravda*, December 2, 1954; *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 5 (1957), p. 225.
40. *Sovetskaya kultura*, January 6, 1955.
41. *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 5 (1957), pp. 223–26. Some lectures delivered at the seminars and at the scientific-atheistic conventions are collected in the volume *Nauka i religiya* (Moscow: 1957); reviewed in *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 8 (1958), pp. 141–53. The recent efforts of Soviet atheistic propaganda include the establishment of a "House of the Atheist" (*Dom Ateista*) in Odessa (*see Sovetskaya Latviya*, April 26, 1958), a new edition of the works of E. Yaroslavsky (*see Sovetskaya Rossiya*, January 19, 1958, and *Kommunist*, No. 5 [1958]) and the publication of a *Popular Library on Atheism* (*see Molodoy kommunist*, No. 8 [1958], pp. 124–26).
42. Y. Aleksandrov and I. Kryvelev, "Scientific-Atheistic Propaganda

in the Pages of the Local Journals of the Party," in *Kommunist*, No. 12 (1958), pp. 92–99. Kryvelev is the author of an illustrated volume entitled *Tales of the Gospel and Their Meaning* (Moscow: 1957).

43. A special antireligious course will be introduced in the universities and high schools of the Soviet Union. If the program will be the same as the one recently proposed and discussed, medical students, in their last year, will attend twenty-four lectures on atheism; students in engineering, agriculture, and pharmacy, fourteen lectures. The study program prepared for the schools in the Ukraine lists nine topics: opposing views of nature and religion; the origin of religions; the reactionary nature of Catholicism; critique of the ideology of the Orthodox Church; religious sects and their reactionary function; Judaism, Buddhism, and Islam; relationship of Party and Church in the U.S.S.R.; forms and methods of scientific antireligious propaganda (*see Vestnik vysshey shkoly*, June, 1958).
44. *Komsomolskaya pravda*, May 10, 1957.
45. This is the question that little Rodka asks his teacher, Praskovya Petrovna in the recent short story of V. Tendryakov, "Chudotvornaya," in *Znamya*, No. 5 (1958), pp. 3–55.
46. P. P. Cherkashin, "On the Social Origins of Religion," in *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 6 (1958), pp. 29–41. *See also* an account of a conference on "Morality and Religion" in the same magazine (No. 9 [1958], pp. 114–16).
47. *Kommunist*, No. 17 (1958).
48. *Molodoy kommunist*, No. 12 (1958).
49. *Partiynaya zhizn*, No. 22 (1958).

CHAPTER 6

1. The author has drawn mainly on the following works for Soviet teaching methodology: M. A. Zinovyev, *Osnovnye voprosy metodiki prepodovaniya istorii* (Moscow: Akademiya pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR, 1948); *Ocherki metodiki prepodavaniya istorii*, ed. by S. D. Skazkin (Moscow: Uchpedgiz Min. Prosveshcheniya RSFSR, 1955); and V. G. Kartsov, *Ocherki metodiki obucheniya istorii SSSR v VIII-X klassakh* (Moscow: Uchpedgiz Min. prosveshcheniya RSFSR, 1955).
2. For a study of Volotsky's views and those of others at that time, *see* W. K. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome* (a political study of

the relations of church and state in Muscovite Russia [Geneva: E. Droz, 1952]), pp. 78ff.

3. *See* T. G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia* (2nd ed.; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1955), I, 199ff.
4. Akademiya nauk SSSR, Fundamentalnaya biblioteka obshchestvennykh nauk, *Istoriya SSSR: Ukazatel sovetskoi literatury za 1917–1952,* I; *S drevneyshikh vremen do vstupleniya Rossii v period kapitalizma* (Moscow: Akademiya nauk SSSR, 1955).
5. E.g., *see Pedagogika i narodnoe obrazovanie v zarubezhnykh stranakh* (Moscow: Akademiya pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR, 1957).
6. E.g., *see* the tenth-grade textbook, *Istoriya SSSR, Chast tretaya* (16th ed.; Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1957), esp. pp. 180ff., 185, where data on Russian economic history show rates of economic growth under capitalism and problems of supply and demand in a money economy. Note also documentary materials, giving evidence of non-Marxist moral and political motivations for revolutionary activity, in *Khrestomatiya po istorii SSSR,* (1953), II, 551, which is a teaching aid for secondary-school teachers.
7. This situation exists in the other fourteen republics of the Soviet Union as well, but since the available source materials pertain primarily to the Russian Republic, this study is meant to reflect the situation there.
8. Zinovyev, *Ocherki metodiki prepodovaniya istorii,* p. 8.
9. Cf. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.); XIV, 277ff.
10. For example, *see* the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences' *Ocherki istorii SSSR* (1953), under the general editorship of N. M. Druzhinin.
11. Pokrovsky was a Deputy People's Commissar of Education. He died in 1932.
12. The background of this decision is subject to careful research. It seems likely that some of the factors behind it were: the end, in the twenties, of the period when revolutionary situations around the world suggested general upheavals; intensification after 1928 of the U.S.S.R.'s national effort to build a socialist society; and the need for a teaching program reflecting higher academic standards, in line with the 1931 reforms.
13. *Spravochnik direktora shkoly* (Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1955), pp. 35–36 and 43ff.
14. Theretofore, history was taught in the social sciences departments of special schools, such as the Communist Academy, the Institute of Red Professors, and the Marx-Engels Institute.

15. In this context, nationalism is not intended to apply to the national aspirations of minority republics in the U.S.S.R.
16. For example, *see Partiynaya zhizn*, No. 9 (1957), p. 36. A study on changes in Soviet historiography has been made under the editorship of Professor Cyril E. Black, *Rewriting Soviet History* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1956).
17. L. I. Karpov and V. A. Severtsev, eds., *Vysshaya shkola* (Moscow: Sovetskaya Nauka, 1957), p. 81.
18. A general discussion of methods is made by C. P. Hill, *Suggestions on the Teaching of History* (Paris: UNESCO, 1953).
19. Glavnoe upravlenie vysshikh i srednikh pedagogicheskikh uchebnykh zavedeni Min. prosveshcheniya RSFSR, *Metodika prepodavaniya istorii* (Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1957), p. 4.
20. *Ibid.*
21. This and other related subjects might well be studied at some length. The purpose of this essay limits discussion here.
22. *Khrestomatiya po istorii SSSR* (Moscow: 1952), III, 654.
23. Glavnoe upravlenie shkol Min. prosveshcheniya RSFRS, *Bilety dlya ekzamenov na attestat zrelosti za kurs sredney shkoly po 1957–58 god*, (Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1958), pp. 13–17.
24. For fuller discussion of teacher training see Norton Dodge's essay, pp. 114–63.

CHAPTER 7

1. Translated from a manuscript in Russian by Richard Kramer.
2. *Pravda*, January 28, 1959.
3. *Pravda*, February 16, 1959.
4. *See*, for instance, *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, No. 3 (1958), p. 8.
5. *Pravda*, September 21, 1958.
6. Cf. *Programmy srednei shkoly po inostrannomu yazyku* (Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1957).
7. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, No. 3 (1958), p. 5.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Draft Program for Foreign Languages* (R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, 1957).
10. N. Karpov, *Metodika obucheniya inostrannym yazykam v nachalnoy shkole* (Moscow: R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Publishing House, 1950), p. 45.
11. *Osobennosti postroeniya urokov inostrannogo yazyka i puti povysheniya ikh effektivnosti* (Voronezh: 1958), p. 8.
12. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, No. 3 (1958), p. 46.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–53.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

CHAPTER 8

1. This essay has been translated from the Russian by Burton Rubin.
2. The following are the various types of Soviet extrascholastic institutions as of January 1, 1956:

Palaces and houses of pioneers	2,382
Young technicians stations	258
Young naturalists stations	214
Excursion-tourist stations	135
Children's parks	135
Children's libraries and divisions	5,923
Puppet theaters	101
Railways	229
Sports schools	806
Stadiums	33

Also an unspecified number of:

Children's houses of artistic training
Children's sections attached to workers' and kolkhoz clubs
Children's houses of culture
Home management circles

3. The following are the typical sections in the houses and palaces of Pioneers:
   a. Pioneer and mass-public work
      i. V. I. Lenin Room
      ii. *Kabinet* for Pioneer and methodology work
      iii. Lecture Room
      iv. Library-Reading Room
      v. Game Library
      vi. Story-Telling Room
      vii. Itinerant Club
   b. Technology
      i. *Kabinets*
      ii. Laboratories and corresponding circles
      iii. Workshops
   c. Naturalists
      i. Instructional and experimental section

ii. Hothouse
iii. Seedbeds
iv. Animal breeding base
v. Zoology *kabinet*

d. Physical culture and sports
i. Halls and play areas; stadiums
ii. Ski equipment
iii. Water-sports equipment
iv. Bicycle equipment

e. Art training
i. Choruses
ii. Orchestras
iii. Studios

f. Tourist section

4. This information has been collected from the following sources: I. A. Kairov and N. K. Goncharov, eds., *Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR*, (Moscow: 1958); M. M. Deineko, *40 let narodnogo obrazovaniya v SSSR* (Moscow: 1957); V. M. Grechko, *Kommunisticheskoe vospitanie v SSSR* (Munich: 1951); Palachina, *Vneshkolnaya rabota*; Kulichenko, *Umelye ruki*; V. Dotsenko, *Detski klub vo dvore.*
5. *Literaturnaya gazeta*, May 19, 1956, p. 2.
6. *Komsomolskaya pravda*, February 1, 1955, pp. 1–2.
7. *Pravda Ukrainy*, June 15, 1955.
8. *Trud*, July 4, 1957.
9. *Sovetskaya Belorussiya*, May 11, 1957.
10. *Pravda Ukrainy*, June 15, 1955.
11. *Zarya Vostoka*, July 25, 1956, pp. 3–6.
12. *Sovetskaya Latviya*, July 1, 1955.
13. *Sovetskaya Litva*, October 21, 1955.
14. *Narodnoe obrazovanie*, No. 4 (1957), pp. 36–37.
15. *Uchitelskaya gazeta*, August 1, 1957.
16. I. A. Kairov and N. K. Goncharov, eds., *op. cit.*

CHAPTER 9

1. I wish to express thanks to Professor George Z. F. Bereday of Teachers College, Columbia University, and Dr. William K. Medlin of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for making available copies of recent Soviet curricula and to Eleanor

Lowman, Nicholas DeWitt, Dr. Homer Dodge, and Dr. Stewart Wallace for helpful comments and criticisms.

2. *Narodnoe khozyaistvo SSSR* (Moscow: Gosstatizdat, 1956), p. 223 and *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo SSSR* (Moscow: Gosstatizdat, 1956), p. 122.
3. *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo SSSR* (Moscow: Gosstatizdat, 1956), p. 122.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 178–79.
5. *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.); XXXIII, 556. The Nineteenth Party Congress also enunciated the policy of gradual transition to universal, compulsory, ten-year education.
6. An examination of the relationship between the Soviet educational system and youth problems may be found in articles by Allen Kassof and by S. V. and Patricia Utechin, *Problems of Communism,* May-June, 1957.
7. Nicholas DeWitt, *Soviet Professional Manpower* (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1955), p. 114.
8. M. M. Deineko, *40 let narodnogo obrazovaniya v SSSR* (Moscow: Uchpedizdat, 1957), p. 112. During the same period, institutes specializing exclusively in the preparation of foreign-language teachers increased from two to fourteen.
9. "Svoevremenno zavershit podgotovku k novomu uchebnomu godu," *Vestnik vysshey shkoly,* No. 7 (1955), p. 2.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *See* Alexander G. Korol, *Soviet Education for Science and Technology* (New York: Technology Press and John Wiley & Sons, 1957), p. 271.
12. Deineko, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
13. A discussion of the effectiveness of Soviet political indoctrination, which is beyond the scope of this paper, may be found in a review article by the writer, "Soviet Education—Four Studies," *Problems of Communism,* March-April, 1958.
14. A comparison of the five-year pedagogical institute curriculum with a 1955 University of Kharkov physics curriculum which totaled only 4,290 hours is much more favorable. Although physics and related courses, such as chemistry, required by the university amounted to 2,620 hours, as compared to 1,758 hours for the pedagogical institute, the university required only sixteen more hours of mathematics courses than the pedagogical institute.
15. The writer has examined university curricula in seven fields, made available to him by the International Education Division of the

U.S. Office of Education. In six of the fields, the curricula were designed for training secondary-school teachers. The five and one-half year physics curriculum, however, was designed to train professional physicists rather than secondary-school teachers. In mathematics, both types of curricula were available, and a comparison showed that the professional curriculum was 138 hours longer than the curriculum for teachers, and that it omitted pedagogy and methods courses. Until a broader sampling of both types of university curricula is available, it will be impossible to evaluate the differences between the two types of university curricula.

16. *See* Homer and Norton Dodge, "Russia Gains Over U.S. in Educating Scientists," *U.S. News and World Report*, September 16, 1955, pp. 94–104, and unpublished memoranda on the Rostov Pedagogical Institute and the Universities of Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov, and Rostov; Korol, *op. cit.*, pp. 235–80 and pp. 354–57; DeWitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 109–14; George S. Counts, *The Challenge of Soviet Education* (New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), pp. 165–70; and *Education in the U.S.S.R.*, Bulletin 1957, No. 14 (Washington, D.C.: Division of International Education, U.S. Office of Education, 1957), pp. 191–94.
17. *See*, for example, Merle E. Brodes and Weldon N. Baker, "A Study of Academic Preparation of the Secondary Science Teachers of Kansas," *The Science Teacher*, October, 1957, pp. 227–80; Charles L. Koelsche, *The Academic and Teaching Background of Secondary Science Teachers in the State of Ohio* (Toledo, Ohio: Research Foundation, University of Toledo, 1958); Lloyd S. Standlee, W. James Popham, and Efthimios Mavrides, *The Preparation and Performance of Indiana Teacher Training Graduates* (Bloomington, Ind.: School of Education, University of Indiana, 1958); Frank B. Stover, S. David Winans, and Wilton A. Wilkins, *Science and Mathematics Teaching in New Jersey Public Schools* (Trenton, N.J.: State of New Jersey Department of Education, 1956); Milton O. Pella, *Status of Science Offerings in Wisconsin Schools, 1955–56* (Madison, Wis.: School of Education, University of Wisconsin); Charles C. Cole, Jr., *Encouraging Scientific Talent* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1956), pp. 127–29; and Milton O. Pella, "The Nature of the Academic Preparation in Science of Wisconsin High-School Teachers of Physics, Chemistry, Biology,

and General Science," *Science Education*, March, 1958, pp. 106–37.

18. *Pravda*, September 21, 1958.

CHAPTER 10

1. *Pravda*, July 23, 1956, p. 2. The blame for this bizarre state of affairs was placed upon the Russian Republic Ministry of Urban and Rural Construction, which made it a habit to transfer men and resources from school construction sites to projects having greater priorities. In general, this is the major reason for troubles with Soviet school construction.
2. *Pravda*, August 4, 1956, p. 2.
3. M. Nyazov, "Bolshe vnimaniya periferiynym VUZ'am," *Pravda*, July 9, 1956, p. 2.
4. Since 1956, four new universities have opened in the East: Kabardino-Balkar State University; Bashkir State University; Yakut State University; Far East State University.
5. The source for this statement is a recent graduate (1956) of Moscow University's philological faculty. According to this former Soviet citizen, the quotas for secondary-school teachers with university degrees are never met because of the reluctance of university graduates to take jobs for which they consider themselves too highly qualified.
6. While Moscow University is Russia's oldest university, Tartu University in Estonia, now part of the U.S.S.R., was established in 1632.
7. On Shuvalov's role, *see*: *Istoriya imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Universiteta* (Moscow: 1855), pp. 7ff; *also Moskovski Gosudarstvenny Universitet* (Moscow: Izdanie Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 1937), p. 9. In the 1937 volume, Shuvalov is credited as the initiator of the project for the founding of Moscow University.
8. M. T. Belyavski, *M. V. Lomonosov i osnovanie Moskovskogo Universiteta* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1955), I, 7. Belyavsky asserts that the initiative for founding the University came from Lomonosov.
9. *Istoriya Moskovskogo Universiteta* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1955), I, 210.
10. Quoted from William H. E. Johnson, *Russia's Educational Heritage* (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1950), p. 108.

11. Unless otherwise noted, the purely objective data on Moscow University in the following pages comes from: *Spravochnik dlya postupayushchikh v Moskovski Universitet v 1955 g.* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1955).
12. The radios at Moscow University and the students' listening habits were described by the recent graduate cited above.
13. This statement applies primarily to all foreign-language books unfriendly to the Soviet Union, plus all Russian-language books published abroad, even the most innocuous ones, as well as all books written by "enemies of the people," regardless of language. Since 1955, some of the walls have been breached, and Western periodicals and most Western literature not in the languages of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. circulate freely.
14. Alexander Korol, *Soviet Education for Science and Technology* (New York: John Wiley and Son, 1957), p. 286.
15. "Dlya sposobnykh i trudolyubivykh," *Vysshaya shkola,* November 23, 1956, p. 2. This article complains that one of the reasons for the deterioration in the quality of technical education since the immediate postwar years is that unqualified people bribe their way through the entrance examinations.
16. Korol, *op. cit.*, pp. 181–82.
17. *Literaturnaya gazeta,* May 10, 1956, p. 2.
18. *Komsomolskaya pravda,* August 16, 1956, p. 2.
19. L., "The Soviet Intelligentsia," *Foreign Affairs,* October, 1957, pp. 124–25.
20. Korol, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
21. *Vestnik vysshey shkoly,* July, 1955, p. 2.

CHAPTER 11

1. For more detail, *see* Raymond A. Bauer, Alex Inkeles, Clyde Kluckhohn, *How the Soviet System Works* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956).
2. *See* Merle Fainsod, *How Russia is Ruled* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), particularly Part II.
3. *See* Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), *also* Parsons and Shils (eds.), *Toward a General Theory of Action* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951).
4. Talcott Parsons, "Some Trends of Change in American Society," *The Journal of the American Medical Association,* CLXVII, No. 1 (May 3, 1958), 31–36.

5. For a more detailed treatment of this topic, *see* the author's article "Soviet Science and Some Implications for American Science and Society," *Journal of International Affairs,* XIII, No. 1 (Winter, 1959), pp. 19–33.
6. In this context, *see* Stalin's revealing (and strangely prophetic) speech of February 4, 1931, on the "Tasks of Business Executives," and particularly his remark that "we are fifty or one hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or they crush us." *Problems of Leninism,* (11th ed.; Moscow: 1940 [in English]), p. 366.
7. Quoted in "American Education, 1958," *Salem College Bulletin,* Spring, 1958, p. 32.
8. C. Arnold Anderson, "The Social Status of University Students in Relation to Type of Economy: An International Comparison," *Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology,* V, 51–63.
9. For an example, *see* Oswald Hall, "The Informal Organization of Medical Practice in an American City." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1944.
10. Bauer, Inkeles, Kluckhohn, *op. cit.;* Robert A. Feldmesser, "The Persistence of Status Advantages in Soviet Russia," *American Journal of Sociology,* March, 1953, 59:493–502.
11. "O pravilakh priema v vysshie uchebnye zavedeniya," in *Direktivy i postanovleniya sovetskogo pravitelstva o narodnom obrazovanii, 1917–47* (Moscow: 1947), II, 3.
12. For a comprehensive treatment of the subject, *see* Robert Allen Feldmesser, "Aspects of Social Mobility in the Soviet Union," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1955.
13. "In the twenties and early thirties, higher educational opportunity was based on a policy of loyalty to the regime, and worker or peasant social origin rather than academic ability . . . a generation of politically indoctrinated leaders, who owed their education . . . to the Party and the State, emerged from Soviet schools and higher institutions. In the haste of the new regime to produce 'politically conscious' [politically reliable] supporters to man key posts, *academic standards had been greatly reduced.*" *Education in the U.S.S.R.,* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Bulletin, 1957, No. 14, p. 172. (Italics supplied.) The "price" paid for the years of the "class approach" can be seen today in the leadership of Soviet scientists which is aged fifty-five plus. Then there is a gap of about ten years, correspond-

ing to the fallow years following the Revolution, and then the younger leaders (under forty-five) come in.

14. *Ibid.*
15. Alex Inkeles, "Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union," *American Sociological Review*, August, 1950, pp. 465–79.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 368–87.
18. Such as the law on tardiness and absenteeism of June 26, 1940; *Vedomosti*, 1940, Nos. 20, 28; the law was later extended to collectivized agriculture on April 13, 1942, *U.S.S.R. Laws*, 1942, text 61. For an English translation of these laws, *see* James H. Meisel and Edward S. Kozera, *Materials for the Study of the Soviet System* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Press, 1950), pp. 356–58, 371.
19. *Sobranie postanovleni i rasporyazheni pravitelstva SSSR*, No. 27 (1940), Section 637; No. 29 (1940), Section 698.
20. *Vedomosti verkhovnogo soveta SSSR*, No. 37 (1940).
21. *Ibid.* Nos. 22, 32, 39 (1943).
22. *Sbornik zakonov SSSR i ukazov prezidiuma verkhovnogo soveta SSSR 1938–1944* (Moscow: 1945), pp. 260–86.
23. Vladimir Gsovski, "Family and Inheritance in Soviet Law," *The Russian Review*, VII, No. 1 (1947).
24. Some of the implications and results of this stratification have already been pointed out in more detail and in a slightly different light in G. Z. F. Bereday's essay, pp. 57–88.
25. One can gather a fair picture of these abuses through a reading of the Soviet press after 1954, particularly *Komsomolskaya pravda*. *Also see* Allen Kasoff, "Youth vs. the Regime: Conflict in Values," *Problems of Communism*, May-June, 1957, pp. 15–23; *also* the author's "Alcoholism, Crime, and Delinquency in Soviet Society," *Social Problems*, 3:100–109, October, 1955.
26. Already discussed earlier with reference to polytechnization by Richard Rapacz.
27. "Stevenson Tells How Ivan Studies," *The New York Times*, November 21, 1958, p. 9.
28. Ivan D. London, "Toward a Realistic Appraisal of Soviet Science," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 13:169–173, 176, May, 1957, 18n.
29. London, *op. cit.*, 17n.
30. "Orphans and children of parents with a low income or who

are burdened down with a large family, are admitted [to the *internaty*] free of charge at the expense of the State." *Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (2nd ed.); L, 403.

31. The announcement of the abolition of fees was carried in *Pravda*, June 10, 1956, p. 1. Prior to this announcement, a number of categories of students were exempted from tuition payments entirely. For a detailed discussion and an enlightening comparison between the Soviet and American situation in this respect, *see* Robert A. Feldmesser, "Social Status and Access to Higher Education: A Comparison of the United States and the Soviet Union," *The Harvard Educational Review*, 27:92–106, Spring, 1957.
32. Thus the attempt, at an earlier period, to do away with the family as an institution was abandoned in the early thirties because children brought up outside of families, or in broken families, or without the close and constant contact with a mother (or mother substitute) developed into adult personalities that did not have the stability, psychological security, and steadfastness required of individuals in an industrialized society with its demands for promptitude, accuracy, and discipline. This, incidentally, is an interesting sociological implication of the work of René Spitz on "hospitalism" and John Bowlby on "maternal deprivation" which shows the ill effects on the child and adult personality of institutional upbringing and the lack of a constant mother figure. (René Spitz, "Hospitalism," *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* [New York: 1945], I, 53–72; John Bowlby, *Maternal Care and Mental Health* [Geneva: 1952]).
33. *Kommunist*, No. 9 (1957), p. 13.
34. "Stevenson Tells How Ivan Studies," *The New York Times*, November 21, 1958, p. 9.
35. "O nekotorykh izmeneniyakh v sostave i ustroystve gosudarstvennykh uchebnykh i vysshikh uchebnykh zavedeni Rossiyskoy respubliki," in K. T. Galkin, *Vysshee obrazovanie i podgotovka nauchnykh kadrov v SSSR* (Moscow: 1958), p. 84.
36. *See Svod zakonov SSSR*, No. 3 (1934), p. 30; (Decree dated January 13, 1934).
37. In *Vysshaya tekhnicheskaya shkola*, No. 1 (1934), p. 76.
38. In 1956, there were 283 institutions accredited to receive candidates' and doctors' dissertations, and 250 accredited to receive only candidates' dissertation. Cited in Alexander G. Korol, *Soviet Education for Science and Technology* (New York: 1957), p. 367.

39. "Ob uchebnykh programmakh i rezhime v vysshikh shkolakh i tekhnikumakh," *Rezolyutsiya TsIK SSSR*, September 19, 1932. For a brief summary of the measures affecting *aspirantura* training *see* Nicholas DeWitt, *Soviet Professional Manpower* (Washington: 1955), pp. 189 ff.
40. At the Twentieth Party Congress, the Minister of Higher Education had mentioned that dissertations often made little reference to the solution of practical and actual problems. Many were of a "compilatory character contributing little useful knowledge." *Pravda,* February 23, 1956.
41. Galkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 159–60.
42. "Attestatsiya nauchnykh kadrov v SSSR," in Galkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–66.
43. Cited in Korol, *op. cit.*, p. 387.
44. In *Vestnik vysshey shkoly*, No. 3 (March 1957), p. 7; cited in Korol, *op. cit.*, p. 394.
45. Korol, *op. cit.*, p. 360.
46. *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo SSSR* (Moscow: 1956), p. 255.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 258.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Recent information indicates that *practical* work experience of at least two years is demanded of all prospective graduate students except of those who are to do work in theoretical fields such as mathematics, physics, and certain other disciplines (Korol, *op. cit.*, p. 376). This, along with such programs as polytechnization, and the encouragement of earning higher degrees while working in production, may be symptomatic of a desire on the part of the political leadership (apparently sparked by Khrushchev) to bring more "reality" and practicality into education, and particularly higher education, and to reduce the hold of the theoreticians.
50. In the elementary schools the enrollment between the 1950-51 and 1955-56 school years has been cut by one half, from 7,500,000 to 3,600,000. *Narodnoe khozyaistvo SSSR* (Moscow: 1956), p. 223.
51. It must be noted, however, that altogether less than one third of all scientific workers held one of the advanced degrees (as of October 1, 1955). Thus, out of 223,893 scientific workers, 9,460 had a doctorate and 77,961 a candidate's degree. *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo*, pp. 252–53.
52. DeWitt, *op. cit.*
53. Korol, *op. cit.*

54. Anti-Semitism has, of course, been an open secret in the Soviet Union since the end of World War II, culminating in the famous "Doctors' Case" shortly before Stalin's death. Perhaps some statistical confirmation might be gleaned from two tables published in the Soviet Union, one in Galkin, *op. cit.*, p. 144, giving the nationalities of *aspirants* in universities under the supervision of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education (and institutions under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Higher Education for the Ukraine); and from a table in *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo*, p. 254, giving the nationalities of scientific workers on October 1, 1955. The table in Galkin lists the *aspirants* according to the fifteen major nationalities corresponding to the fifteen constituent republics and adds a catch-all category—"other nationalities"—as follows:

	1947	*1950*	*1953*	*1955*
All Aspirants	6,650	7,887	11,026	11,023
Other nationalities	1,326	697	501	764

Thus, while according to these figures the number of *aspirants* almost doubled from 1947 to 1955, the number of *aspirants* of "other nationalities" decreased by almost 50 per cent (the decrease in 1953, the year of the "Doctors' Case" was over 60 per cent). What is the place of the Jews in these "other nationalities"? The other table may supply an answer: in 1955, there were 223,893 scientific workers in the Soviet Union: if, from this number, we subtract those who belong to the fifteen major nationalities (corresponding to the same nationalities in the Galkin table) we will be left with a balance of 31,523 who would fall in the "other nationalities" category. Of these, Jews are listed as having 24,620 workers, or close to 80 per cent. And if there is approximately the same distribution of scientists of the different nationalities among the *aspirants* (from whose ranks most of these scientists should come) then one would be entitled to believe in a sizeable reduction of the number of students of Jewish origin selected for advanced training, particularly since the 1955 figures from *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo* may already reflect the results of the anti-Semitic campaign (without this campaign, the percentage of Jewish scientists among the "other nationalities" might have been higher than 80 per cent). Of course, one might always argue that (1) these figures reflect an actual drop in the number or proportion of able Jewish students, or (2) conversely, that prior to 1947, Jews were ad-

mitted to advanced studies who did not merit such admission and the situation is being corrected now. These explanations are possible but appear unlikely.

55. *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo*, p. 251.

56. It is interesting to note that prior to 1950, psychotherapy as a method of treating this neurosis was an officially disapproved modality because it was idealistic and "non-Pavlovian." In 1950, a joint session of the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences was held to introduce more "Pavlovian" concepts into medicine. This, as Ivan D. London points out, might have spelled the death blow to psychotherapy. But Pavlov's theory includes reference to the "second signal system" unique in man among animals, in which verbal stimuli substitute for physical stimuli in the conditioned-reflex scheme. Since psychotherapy operates through the medium of language, to practice psychotherapy is to be a good Pavlovist. "Therefore to Pavlovize psychiatry means also to cultivate psychotherapy . . . psychotherapeutics is a legitimate discipline and psychotherapy a permissible technique." Ivan D. London, *op. cit.*

Notes on Contributors

RAMAZAN KARÇA is a graduate of the Philosophical Faculty, Rostow University, and is now Senior Research Worker in Soviet Education at the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. in Munich.

RICHARD V. RAPACZ is completing his doctorate in comparative education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and is now an instructor in comparative education at Boston University.

JAAN PENNAR received his doctorate in political science at Princeton University and is now American Counselor to the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. He was the Institute Coordinator to the Seminar on Soviet Education.

GEORGE Z. F. BEREDAY received his doctorate in comparative education at Harvard University, and is now Professor of Comparative Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. He was Director of the Seminar on Soviet Education.

FATHER ALESSIO U. FLORIDI, S.J., received his doctorate in philosophy at the State University of Rome and studied at the Collegium Russicum. He is now Associate Editor of *La Civiltà Catolica.*

WILLIAM K. MEDLIN received his doctorate in political science at the University of Geneva and is now specialist in comparative education for Eastern Europe at the U. S. Office of Education.

DAVID BURG is a graduate of the Philological Faculty, Moscow University, and served as a consultant to the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. during the session of the Seminar. He is currently studying at Cambridge University.

IRENE MAREUIL studied at the Slavonic Faculty of the University of Leiden and has earned the Diploma in Russian Studies at the School of Oriental Languages of the University of Paris.

NORTON DODGE is completing his doctorate in economics at Harvard University and is now Assistant Professor of Economics at the University of Maryland.

BURTON RUBIN is completing his doctorate in Slavic languages at Columbia University and is an instructor in Russian at Amherst College. He is currently studying at the University of Leningrad.

MARK A. FIELD received his doctorate in sociology at Harvard University and is now Research Associate at the Russian Research Center, Harvard University.